

UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN  
APR 11 1952

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

AP

*The*  
*London Quarterly*  
&  
*Holborn Review*

LITERATURE · HISTORY · SOCIOLOGY  
RELIGION · THEOLOGY · PHILOSOPHY  
EDITOR · LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

*Contributors Include*

A. JOHN BADCOCK, M.A.  
HARRY BELSHAW, B.A.  
HARRY BUCKLEY  
CYRIL J. DAVEY  
TOM DRING  
G. H. FINDLAY, M.A.  
T. FRANCIS GLASSON, M.A., D.D.  
WILBERT F. HOWARD, F.B.A., M.A., D.D.  
R. KISSACK, M.A., B.D.  
V. DONALD SIDDONS, M.B.E., D.F.C., B.A.  
C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D.

*London*  
THE EPWORTH PRESS  
(FRANK E. CUMBERS)  
*25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1*

APRIL 1952

PRICE FOUR SHILLINGS NET

**THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW**  
 is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

### Contents

Editorial Comments by Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D.	81	Pioneers of Southern Rhodesia by Harry Buckley	129
Aspects of the Medieval Idea of God by A. John Badcock, M.A.	86	Some Recent Contributions to New Testament Study by W. F. Howard, F.B.A., M.A., D.D.	134
Swine, Sound, and Sanity by Harry Belshaw, B.A.	97	Holy Communion and Sacrifice by V. D. Siddons, M.B.E., D.F.C., B.A.	137
Apocalyptic—Some Current Delusions by T. Francis Glasen, M.A., D.D.	104	'The Dean' Once Again by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	141
The World Family in History by Tom Dring	111	Doddridge Makes a Sermon by R. Kinsack, M.A., B.D.	142
The Village Where Dreams Come True by Cyril J. Davey	118	Recent Literature Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	146
First and Last Words by G. H. Findlay, M.A.	123	Our Contributors	160

## A Good Investment

Since it was founded eighty-three years ago the National Children's Home has given to over 35,000 orphaned and destitute boys and girls the chance in life which misfortune has denied.

It costs a lot to provide for this large family, but the money so spent yields a rich dividend. The bulk of the income is derived from voluntary contributions and an urgent appeal is made for continued and increased support.

*Covenanted gifts and legacies are specially solicited.*

## National Children's Home

CHIEF OFFICES: HIGHBURY PARK, LONDON, N.5

## Editorial Comments

### A NEW ELIZABETHAN AGE

WE HAVE grown used to easy characterizations of our times. For the most part they are materialistic, and we have come to accept 'The Machine Age' or 'The Age of Science' as sufficiently descriptive. The dangers of over-mechanization, over-standardization and over-rationalization have been recognized, and some have lamented the decline or gradual disappearance of moral and spiritual values. Optimists, glorying in the newest scientific discoveries, point to a Golden Age approaching; pessimists, alarmed by economic problems and by rearmament, focus attention on the threat of war with its satanic terrors.

Suddenly the old phrases have been flung aside and from press and pulpit we are being urged to go bravely forward into a new Elizabethan Age. This, if it be correctly understood, is less materialistic. At first sight, it seems to be a consequence of the passing of King George VI and the accession of his daughter, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II to whom he bequeathed so splendid a legacy of goodwill and high endeavour. Is this reminder of the splendours of the sixteenth century due simply to the naming of the Queen, or is it significant of the inadequacy of materialistic goals? Are we going to put the machine in its place, and recognize once more, the spiritual values of human personality? It was natural enough that we should call to mind our other Queens, and should think especially of that first Elizabeth whose name characterizes one of the nobler periods of our history. The great Elizabethans have been hailed again as potential prototypes. We have been exhorted to make our times more spacious, to emulate these great venturers—Drake and Hawkins, Shakespeare and Cecil, Sidney the gentle knight and Parker, the great Archbishop. It has been a reminder of personalities rather than of achievements. We have found ourselves thinking not so much of territorial expansion and commercial prosperity, as of gallant spirits who triumphed over circumstance and even over time.

It has been said that there are many recurrent phrases in the folk tales and fairy tales of the world. Amongst them is the imperative demand that the hero must always embark on some exploit which will take him 'to the end of the world—and beyond'. But where can he go when he gets to the end of the world? Surely his only further journey must be inwards—to that realm of the spirit which cannot be measured by miles. His adventure will take him 'a year—and a day.' He must go on beyond the natural boundary of time. Now we are called to look again at the Elizabethans we are thinking not only of the lonely mariners, who steered their cockle-shells to new countries or a New World, but of that venture of faith which laughed at storms, and defied the warnings of the ancient maps which declared of the unknown lands 'Here be giants'. There are limits to geographical discovery, limits to economic and literary experiments, but there is no limit to the exploration of the realm of the spirit. As Hugh Black once said, adventurers of action would have faded out without

adventures of thought. We can answer the challenge to create a new Elizabethan Age not because the release of physical energy should be welcomed as a commercial proposition but because the spirit of man is not yet broken and is capable of making great ventures in this unlikely time. It was a great achievement to sail round the world in the *Golden Hind*, but Drake was at his best when he landed on an unknown and unfriendly shore and straightway knelt to receive the Holy Sacrament. There he confessed his allegiance to his Lord and fed on Him in his heart by faith with thanksgiving. So today we hear, with awe, of man's new knowledge of the world in which he lives. This is the gift of the new Elizabethans in the laboratory, but we can only greet their discoveries with gladness when we are sure of what man intends to do with them. A new Elizabethan Age concerned only with physical phenomena, or even intellectual development, has little to offer a world that denies or despises Peace and Love. Without the qualities of the spirit man may, by his very triumphs, rob life of its majestic purpose. 'What is the use of living in an Empire on which the sun never sets, if we dwell in an alley in which the sun never shines?'

It is, however, a welcome change to get away from the machine or the chemical reaction and turn to the man behind the machine and the chemist behind the retort—in short, to speak of Elizabethans, old or new, who are at least human beings. Most people were moved by the challenge recently broadcast by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who stressed so strongly the spiritual qualities of the Elizabethan Age, and called us to another Reformation.

As one pauses at the beginning of a new reign one realizes how much the shaping of the years to come depends on human personality, divinely guided and strengthened.

'I am but a little child,' said Solomon as in early manhood he was called to take great David's place. 'And Thy servant is in the midst of Thy people. . . . Give Thy servant an understanding heart.' That prayer, we believe, is even now being offered by a young Queen and many of her devoted people. Looking back over the years one feels God has been preparing that gift, which already she begins to inherit. Her two immediate predecessors have bravely blazed a trail.

If the reverence for the Crown was re-established by Queen Victoria and strengthened, particularly in Europe, by King Edward VII, it was deepened and made more intimate by King George V whose people gave him not only respect but a great measure of affection. Of him Mr Churchill wrote: 'In a world of ruin and chaos King George V brought about a resplendent rebirth of the great office which fell to his lot. . . . A singular completeness and symmetry dignifies his reign. . . . He died surrounded by his loved ones, amidst the respect of mankind and the grief of all his subjects.' Here is a hint of that wise and understanding heart which is such an essential in the character of a true king. Few monarchs have had his rare blend of pride and humility, fewer still his constant and relentless conception of duty.

When King George VI came so suddenly and unexpectedly to the throne the world was astonished at his quiet appreciation of his problems. On the first day of his reign Princess Helena Victoria went to see him. She found him already at his desk. Above it was his father's motto: 'Teach me to be obedient to the rules of the game.' She said to him: 'What are you going to do?' He



answered immediately: 'I don't know, but I am going to do my best.' It was evident that he *knew* the rules and honoured them. But could he straightway take the lead?

As Duke of York, when in his mid-twenties, he made one of his first public speeches, he talked of the gifts necessary in a leader: 'To my mind,' he said, 'he must possess three great qualities, personality, sympathy and, above all, idealism. There is no need for me to speak of personality. Of sympathy I will say just this—its keynote is personal contact and understanding. Of idealism—nobody can lead unless he has the gift of vision, and the desire in his soul to leave things in the world a little better than he found them. He will strive for which may appear unattainable but which he believes in his heart can one day be reached; if not by him, by his successors, if he can help to pave the way.' He had written the speech himself and it was an unconscious prophecy, made in early manhood by one who himself had inherited an understanding heart. In the fifteen years of his reign he made no spectacular entrances in that world tragedy in which he played a leading part. He lived in Buckingham Palace, not in Hollywood, and he led his people steadfastly, with perfect poise and unflinching courage, never more royal, perhaps, than when he came with his Queen from their own bombed home to the blitzed people of the East End of London. The Emperor Napoleon standing before the Pyramids called on forty centuries to witness his triumph, but the pageantry of his advent never stirred the hearts of his people so deeply as the unheralded visitations of King George VI and his devoted Queen to Whitechapel and Stepney or Poplar. His was a quiet conquest not of armies but of human hearts, troubled and tormented but never surrendering to fear. The speech of Queen Elizabeth I to her troops at Tilbury is carved deep on the tablets of history but the Christmas broadcast of King George VI which ended 'Put your hand into the hand of God. It shall be better than a light and safer than a known way' will remain, for ever, proof of a heart that understood the hopes and fears of his subjects and reached the depths of the human spirit—the depths where faith is born. So the years passed and we saw the full stature of his manhood and, lo, to all the world he was a king, beloved. Some have dared to say that never has any monarch been better loved. He passed so swiftly from us that he had no time to hand on the torch. There was no need. The one who was to follow him had been receiving the gift of the understanding heart through all the years.

In Windsor Forest during the terrors of war the young Princesses had shared their games with the children of the gardeners and the rangers. In Basutoland, when twenty Girl Guides in a closed omnibus peered eagerly through the glass windows *because they were lepers*, Princess Elizabeth and her sister had gone quickly over to talk to them. The action was natural and inevitable. It was not merely a duty; it was a privilege. Innumerable instances pointed to the fact that the future Queen of England had inherited the gift. 'The sun seemed always to be shining,' she said as she spoke of her childhood's home.

And now we look for a new Elizabethan Age. There are many things to give us courage to believe it shall outshine its predecessors. The valour, the intellectual energies, the religious developments of the sixteenth century remain unquestioned. There is evidence today that these things are already matched—

but there is in addition a more intimate and spiritual relationship between the Queen and her people; 'I have placed my chiefest strength and safeguard in the loyal hearts and goodwill of my subjects,' said the first Elizabeth, and her people did not fail her. But it would have been difficult to imagine her speaking to youth all over the world as did the girl who marked her twenty-first birthday by an act of simple but complete dedication. Speaking from Cape Town in 1947, Princess Elizabeth said: 'I should like to make that dedication now. It is very simple. I declare, before you all, that my whole life, whether it be long or short, shall be devoted to your service. . . . God help me to keep my vow.' With that heritage of the understanding heart the Princess has become the Queen. With that spirit of dedication the nation may play its part not only in recapturing the spirit of Elizabethan England, but in helping to transform a Machine Age into a Golden Age—not of minted money but of the human spirit, refined in the fire, purged of its dross, pure gold. And so, with understanding hearts, we pray in this hour, God bless the Queen.

### HUGH BOURNE AND WILLIAM CLOWES

LAST year marked the centenary of the death of William Clowes, and this October Methodists will commemorate the centenary of Hugh Bourne. Academic discussions as to which of these great men should be acclaimed the founder of Primitive Methodism are interesting enough, but not conclusive. Who can judge between them and why should we demand a final verdict? These two strong personalities, unlike in temperament but one in their passion for souls, lit a fire which did much to purify the life of the nation. It is high time that the present generation should rediscover the secret of their devoted and triumphant living. An opportunity to read of their 'exploits of faith' is to be found in two books<sup>1</sup> written by the Rev. J. T. Wilkinson, M.A., B.D., Ranmoor Tutor of Church History in Hartley Victoria College, Manchester. In his study of William Clowes, Mr Wilkinson has used all the available first sources, and presented a portrait that is strangely attractive and convincing. We see a man who went out into the wilderness, moved by his concern for his fellows, and by the grace of God changed the barren land into fruitful fields with here and there a garden. 'The secret of his achievement lay in the quality of his own inner experience,' says his latest biographer. His congregations, often great crowds gathered in the open air, listened spell-bound to a man who said: 'In preaching I heard the sound of my Master's footsteps behind me.' We are glad that this short but stirring biography is available and that an account of Hugh Bourne, by the same author, is now in the press.

In the July issue of this Review we are arranging for specially commissioned articles to be written by contributors who will write authoritatively on Hugh Bourne. A commemorative play<sup>2</sup> by the Rev. George Percival is being produced and it is hoped that these arrangements will help in the rediscovery, not only of Clowes and Bourne, but of those spiritual energies which revitalized the people of the early nineteenth century.

<sup>1</sup> *William Clowes (1780-1851)*, Epworth Press, 6s. net, and *Hugh Bourne*, Epworth Press (to be published shortly).

<sup>2</sup> *Hugh Bourne—A Play*, Epworth Press.

There may be reasons for the disappearance of the camp-meetings as they knew them, but the needs of our own day demand, at least, some equivalent. It may be that the new evangelism will prove to be directly related to the field-preaching of the Wesleys and the camp-meetings of William Clowes and Hugh Bourne.

### THE POEMS OF GILBERT THOMAS

IN presenting a selection of his poems,<sup>3</sup> Gilbert Thomas has gratified his many friends. Most modest of men, he has some of the songs which 'came', as he says, 'falling ready-made into the mind.' Working busily in a publisher's office, he explains with charming candour, that they had 'some of the virtues of spontaneity' and 'they certainly had the defects'. In this welcome book we meet a friend, who scorns the artificial and never writes to order. 'It is the poet's business in any age, not to study the mode, but to look into his own heart. . . . No poem has sprung from a direct effect of mind or will.' As we read them we knew, at once, they were the songs of experience. That is why his verses on *The Quiet Harvest*, *For One departed*, *Toward the Dawn*, *Spring in Wartime* and *Bartimeus* were, each in its own way a spiritual benediction.

This is not a book to be read as a specimen of poetic workmanship, though it has its value there, but it is an intimate manual of devotion. The singer shares his problems, his joys and his sorrows with a generosity for which we are most thankful. On an April in war-time he sings from the depth of his heart:

*So sweet it was, I fled; I could not face  
The scourge of God's forgiveness. 'I could bear  
Amid the world's red guilt and black despair,  
Thy wrath,' I cried, 'but not Thy mercy, Lord!  
Oh, spare me from the year's unfolding grace,  
For every flower is as a two-edged sword.'*

LESLIE F. CHURCH

<sup>3</sup> *Selected Poems*, Gilbert Thomas, Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.

## Articles

### ASPECTS OF THE MEDIEVAL IDEA OF GOD

THERE have been few periods when the idea of God has failed to attract the attention of philosophers. In the Middle Ages it dominated the world of thought. It is true, as Christopher Dawson admits, that 'to the scientist the Middle Ages are still the Dark Ages and Medieval religion is still regarded as an obscurantist force which set back and retarded the development of scientific thought'. That side of the picture has been painted often, and rightly so. But there is need for the recognition that the medieval scene was not one of unrelieved gloom. On the contrary it was illumined by a view of life which gave both unity and purpose to every part of it. This outlook was not fortuitous. It was the expression of a conception of life which was based upon a fundamental idea: the idea of God.

Everywhere in medieval philosophy the natural order leans on a supernatural order, depends on it as for its origin and end. Man is an image of God: the beatitude he seeks is a divine beatitude, the adequate object both of his intellect and his will lies in a being transcendent to himself, before whom his whole moral life is played out, and by whom it is judged. The very physical world, created as it is for God's glory tends with a kind of blind love toward its Author; and each being, each operation of each being depends momentarily, for existence and efficacy, on an omnipotent conserving will.<sup>1</sup>

In this conception the universe and everything in it was rationally ordered. The entire scheme was based on a primal act of faith that God was a reasonable being and therefore his whole creation was rational. It will be our business here to examine the origin and nature of this concept of God, and in particular to note the interplay of two characteristics essential to it, the ideas of transcendence and immanence.

#### THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE MEDIEVAL IDEA OF GOD

There can be little doubt that the medieval conception of God sprang from two roots—Greek philosophy and Hebrew religion. In the former, the crude polytheism revealed in the myths about the Gods was later refined and gave place to a more serious conception. By c. 500 B.C. Xenophanes and his Eleatic school had proclaimed the existence of a single non-anthropomorphic deity. Plato in his earlier works refers with casual alternation to both 'God' and 'the Gods', but makes no assertion of a unitary conception of deity. In the *Timaeus* he presents us with the figure of a divine Craftsman, a being of supreme goodness and intelligence who contemplates the Forms and moves and orders all material things to a good end. Later still, in his *Nomoi*, written in old age, there is clear indication of a definite belief in one God. Aristotle recognizes 'the Gods' but speaks of them as subordinate to his primordial principle, the

<sup>1</sup> Etienne Gilson, *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*, p. 364.

unmoved mover. While this conception lacks some elements, to be noted later, which are found in the full medieval idea of God, it is difficult to dispute the claim that Aristotle was a monotheist.

By contrast with Greek philosophy the Hebrew-Christian tradition brought to the common medieval stock a monotheism which was less intellectual and speculative but ethically and emotionally more compelling. It was the unique conception of an austere God who was personal, holy and righteous. This Being had been revealed to Moses and the prophets and supremely through Jesus Christ. It was a lofty and exclusive conception which would tolerate nothing of apotheosis in the Greek manner, and was passionately opposed to idolatry in all its forms. Before considering the synthesis which resulted from the fusion of these two conceptions, the Greek and the Hebrew, it is necessary to look more closely at each of them in turn.

#### THE ARISTOTELIAN GOD

There seems no reason to dispute the judgement of W. R. Matthews that 'the most characteristic and consistent product of Greek thought on God is Aristotle's eternal Thinker who abides beyond good and evil'. When we consider Aristotle's description of this being, the characteristics which he postulates of divinity are soon clearly revealed. Aristotle's view of the universe was of an ordered hierarchy of causes culminating in the First Mover. 'First', however, is not to be understood in any temporal sense, since Aristotle holds motion to be eternal. The First Mover is the eternal source of eternal motion: it causes change without itself being changed. Furthermore, the First Mover is not a Creator-God, for in Aristotle's view the world has not been created; it has existed from all eternity. God forms the world by acting as final cause: He is the object of desire.

Aristotle shows, in *Metaphysics*, A6ff., that because God, the First Mover, is of this kind then he must be ἐνέργεια, pure act without potentiality. It follows that since materiality involves the possibility of change God must be immaterial. His activity is therefore purely intellectual. Its object must be the best of all possible objects which knows neither sensation nor change. Such knowledge exists only in God himself. So Aristotle arrives at his definition of God. He is subsistent thought, νόησις νοήσεως, thought thinking about itself. God's knowledge has only itself for object.

Thus the dominant factor in Aristotle's conception of God is transcendence, and it is a conception in which there is scarcely any place for a theory of immanence. There are occasions, it is true, when he expresses himself in such a way that some doctrine of immanence seems to be implied. In the *Metaphysics* (A1075.a.11-15) for example, he speaks of God existing as an immanent order in the world, as well as a transcendent spirit. 'We should consider in which of two ways the nature of the whole possesses the good and the best—whether as something existing separately and by itself, or as the order of the whole. Perhaps we should say that it possesses the good in both ways, as an army does. For it is true both that its good is in its order, and that its leader is its good, and the latter in a higher degree; for he does not exist by reason of the order, but the order by reason of him.' Here the implication seems clear that God plans the development of the universe, and in so far as he does must be regarded



as immanent. The same idea is expressed by Aristotle before he elaborates his theory of the Unmoved Mover, in the well-known line of *De Caelo* (271.a.33): 'God and nature do nothing in vain.'

Yet it must be insisted that these are isolated instances. The weight of Aristotle's thought is in favour of God's transcendence. The Unmoved Mover does not know this world, and there is no divine plan which is fulfilled here. He is not the Creator nor does he exercise divine providence over the world. Aristotle nowhere speaks of God as an object of worship, for being entirely self-centred it is out of the question that men should attempt personal intercourse with him. Even if it were possible for men to love God, that love could not be returned by God. Attempts have been made to argue that since all things owe their origin to God, therefore God's self-knowledge must include knowledge of all things. But whoever else may argue for such a position Aristotle does not. 'For him, that God should know himself, and that he should know other things, are alternatives, and in affirming the first alternative he implicitly denies the second. Indeed he denies explicitly much that the second would involve; he denies to God all knowledge of evil, and all transition from one object of thought to another. The result of the wish to exclude from the divine life any relation to evil and any "shadow of turning" is the impossible and barren ideal of a knowledge with no object but itself.'<sup>2</sup>

This, then, would appear to be Aristotle's final conclusion, that the divine mind has no knowledge of anything outside itself. It is enclosed in self-sufficiency, neither knowing nor willing the universe. It is the logical culmination of a hierarchy of substances and the ultimate explanation of motion and change. But it cannot be regarded as a person who orders all things and exercises a providence over them. It may be an individual, conscious living being, realizing perfectly and eternally a kind of life to which human beings can never attain. But it is not a being with whom we can enter into personal relations. It is not a personal God because Aristotle's theology is detached from the religious tradition which connects the divine directly with the social life of man. It would be difficult indeed to find a concept of deity more thorough-going in its transcendence than that of Aristotle.

#### THE HEBREW-CHRISTIAN GOD

The Hebraic conception of God, like the Greek, did not emerge full-grown. It developed. Everything in Israel's environment encouraged polytheism, but it did not prevail. For throughout the centuries there emerged a belief in one God. The nature of this God was divined through what he had accomplished for the nation. Between him and the nation there was a cardinal relationship, a covenant: Jahveh was the God of Israel, Israel the people of Jahveh. The nationalistic element in this conception was ultimately transcended and the conviction forced itself home that Jahveh was the God of the whole earth, while Israel's mission was to declare his nature universally. Thus through all biblical thought concerning God there runs a fundamental paradox. It is the assertion, continually reiterated, that God is at once transcendent and immanent. On the one hand He is high and lifted up, irresistible in power,

<sup>2</sup> W. D. Ross, *Aristotle*, p. 183.

awful in majesty, a being before whose presence all other beings are humbled to the dust. But also, He is a compassionate being, full of tender mercy, to whom men may turn confidently in trouble. He achieves His purpose by making His dwelling-place with men. The Lord of Hosts is also the God of Jacob.

These two aspects of deity, are, in Hebrew thought, strictly correlative. If either of them is removed, the other becomes meaningless. 'Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones' (Isaiah 57<sup>15</sup>). This writer is justly cited by Snaith<sup>3</sup> as probably the finest example in Hebrew thought of this paradoxical element. For he is at once the prophet who teaches most clearly the transcendence of God, while insisting with equal force upon His immanence. In his work the uniqueness and separateness of God is characterized by the frequent use of the phrase 'Holy One'. This being is the Creator of the heavens and the earth. Incomparable in power, He is not only creator of the natural world but the supreme arbiter of the destinies of nations and of men. It is important that this element of transcendence in the Hebrew idea of God should be clearly recognized, for it is integral to the whole conception. Aristotle defining the Unmoved Mover never surpasses in description the sense of 'otherness' which characterizes Jahveh. By His very nature Jahveh is supreme over all and distinct from all lesser beings. He is the High God and therefore essentially not man.

But this alone is not the distinctive element in the Hebraic conception. God is different from man but He is not remote from him. There is nothing of passive or static aloofness in the Deity. The Hebrew does not think of Him as away from the world in splendid isolation. On the contrary his God is always essentially active in the world which He has made. The Hebrew does not say that God 'is' or that God 'exists'; he speaks constantly of what God 'does'. This is how God is known. Here then is the distinctive element in Hebrew thought; the transcendent God is at the same time essentially, dynamically immanent. Hosea sums it up in a sentence. 'I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee' (Hosea 11<sup>9</sup>).

It is precisely this emphasis on both aspects of the divine nature which is perpetuated in Christianity. For the Christian, as for the Hebrew, God is Creator and Judge, a personal being whose nature is righteous will. For both Jew and Christian that will is expressed in actions, and it is through these actions done in time that the Divine Purpose is realized. Again, for both Jew and Christian the Divine Purpose necessitates a chosen community. Finally, for the Christian, Jesus is at once the supreme manifestation of the Divine nature and the clearest evidence that God is both transcendent and immanent.

In all this there is something different from the thought-forms of the Greeks. It is true that in the polytheistic stage the gods were persons whose acts were definite, if not always righteous, acts of will. But as polytheism was outgrown and the unitary conception came to the fore, the personal character of the deity faded. God became a Divine Power, general, static, remote.

Again, the time-process played little if any part in Greek thought. It was an

<sup>3</sup> *Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament.*

eternal recurrence which led nowhere. The wise Greek was as little concerned with time as possible. He sought peace rather in the contemplation of timeless, static ideas.

Over against this aloof and distant deity, isolated from the world, the Hebrew set his God. Without yielding any element of majesty, Jahveh is in intimate and continuous relationship with the world which He created. He is at once both transcendent and immanent.

#### THE MEDIEVAL SYNTHESIS

In the Middle Ages the conception of God which held the field was one which ignored neither the ideas of the Greeks nor those of the Hebrews. Up to the twelfth century the main influence of Greek thought in the medieval world was Neoplatonic. Replacing Stoicism, which ceased to hold sway in the second century, Neoplatonism brought about a significant change in natural philosophy. For the Stoics, scientific investigation was highly important and great attention was paid to the reign of law in Nature. To the Neoplatonists, the material world was the lowest of all the elements and matter was evil. Setting aside empirical knowledge they created an atmosphere in which scientific research was considered unnecessary. When Augustine confesses his debt to Plotinus, the greatest of the Neoplatonists, he goes on to commend knowledge of God and the soul as the only desirable objects of knowledge, dismissing the investigation of Nature as without profit. With the twelfth century came a change. The works of Aristotle were rediscovered: works covering the whole range of the natural sciences. And with their recovery came the recognition of Aristotle as 'master of those who know in every field of human speculation'. For the Middle Ages he was not merely the initiator of a philosophical system but the personification of the human reason. Throughout the twelfth century, therefore, increasing attention was paid to all things Aristotelian and by the middle of the thirteenth century his works had been translated direct from the Greek and occupied the central position in medieval thought. But the change of emphasis from Neoplatonism to Aristotelianism was not effected without conflict. Suspicion centred on those ideas of Aristotle which seemed to contradict or were subversive of Christian doctrine. It was Aquinas who attempted the great task of reconciling the new philosophy with the Christian faith. The clamant need of the medieval world was for a reinforcement of the scientific spirit, and the contribution of Aristotle's thought to the supplying of that need was a great one. In accordance with his ideas rational speculation came to the fore and the spirit of exact and dispassionate observation was encouraged. It was because Aristotle was much nearer than Plotinus to Nature that there grew up the conception of an hierarchic order whose ultimate foundation was God and that this order was worthy of study and explanation as a means of increasing man's knowledge of the Divine. Whereas Neoplatonism had tended to disparage created things as mere shadows of the world of essences, Aristotle reminded men that the things of experience had a being and an activity of their own, and deserved to be looked at for their own sake. The new emphasis, then, brought with it the full acknowledgement that human knowledge depended upon sensation. Sense experience was no longer merely a jumping-off ground; it was recognized as the material for all human thought. This was

the inescapable conclusion from Aristotle's repeated insistence on the necessity for experiment and observation. The effects of Aristotle's natural theology based on his physics and cosmology can be traced in the work of Aquinas.

#### THE THOMIST GOD

When we consider the thought of Aquinas it is clear that in framing his system he follows Aristotle and the Greek tradition as closely as he can. In that tradition the existence of God was regarded as a conclusion established by argument. Following his master Aquinas held that we can have no direct knowledge of anything except the world of nature as perceived by our senses. God, a non-sensible reality, cannot therefore be known by us except through his effects, the things which he has made. Through the things of sense, Thomas holds, it is possible to have knowledge of God's existence but not of his nature. Thus our knowledge of God's existence is positive but our knowledge of his nature is negative. We can say what he is not, but not what he is. 'Hence from the knowledge of sensible things the whole power of God cannot be known; from which it follows that His essence cannot be seen.'<sup>4</sup>

Here, of course, we see Thomas's fundamental agreement with the conception of God set forth by Aristotle. The deity is utterly above the time process, transcendently aloof. It is not possible for man to have any contact with God, or any understanding of His nature.

There can be little doubt that Aquinas, like other medieval thinkers, welcomed Aristotle's transcendent God for a very good reason. It was a safeguard against the danger that the deity might be identified with nature. It disposed of any theory of immanence which might represent as the principal manifestations of the deity those things which are of most account in the material system, whether they be stars or forces of nature.

But though Aquinas accepted Aristotle's god he could not so so without qualification. For Aquinas was a Christian, and, as we have seen, the Hebrew-Christian God, while sublimely transcendent was also immanent. Here then was a formidable difficulty for Aquinas. The Unmoved Mover, dwelling aloof, ceaselessly contemplating his own essence, must be shown to be identical with the Heavenly Father of Christianity who indwells His creation and guides men by His providence. Clearly, the extreme transcendence of Aristotle's deity must be modified so that the reconciliation may be effected.

The attempt of Aquinas to do this may be illustrated in two particulars. In the first place, he seeks to maintain that the self-contemplation of Aristotle's god does not exclude the possibility of his knowing things other than himself. The Mohammedan philosophers had already faced this problem and the solution which Aquinas offered was based on a principle similar to theirs, though with more extensive application. The germ of it is given in his *Commentary on the Metaphysics* (Lib. XII, Cap. ix, lect. 8.). It does not follow, he holds, that all things other than Aristotle's god are unknown to him 'for in knowing himself he knows all things'. 'Moreover, according as a cause is the more perfectly known, so is its effect the more known in the cause, for the effects are contained in the power of their cause. Since, therefore, upon the first cause, which is God, depend the heaven and all nature, as has been said, it appears that God, in

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I.xii.12.

knowing himself, knows all things.' Again, in *De Veritate* (q. 2, art. 3, ad. 5m) he tries to show that when Aristotle declares that God knows only himself other things must be included in God's knowledge. There are two ways, says Aquinas, in which a thing is known; firstly, in itself, and secondly in some other thing, which being known, it is known. 'Hence God knows only himself in himself, other things, in truth, he knows in themselves, but in knowing his own essence; and in this sense the Philosopher said that God knows only himself.' But however satisfactory this may be to Aquinas we cannot allow that it is sound Aristotelianism; because, as we have seen earlier, for Aristotle, God's knowledge of Himself and His knowledge of other things are alternatives.

In the second place, when Aquinas insists on the self-sufficiency of God he maintains that God's love of His own perfection leads Him to will that it be imitated by the creatures in a plurality of modes. Thomas is careful not to admit that God is constrained by necessity to will the universe. Such a concession might lead to pantheism. But in holding his position Aquinas becomes involved in one of the oldest difficulties associated with the idea of extreme transcendence. For if the universe contributes nothing to the divine nature, what is its purpose and why does God will it? Thomas's position surely commits him to the admission that the universe does contribute something to the divine perfection. Whatever the motive of the deity, the logical outcome is the same. The universe serves some purpose, fills some need in the divine nature. It is just that conception which cannot be reconciled with the god of Aristotle, and in the Aristotelian scheme there is no place for the idea of creation. But in Thomism there is: on the Christian hypothesis there must be. There seems, therefore, no escape from the conclusion that the ideas of God held by Aristotle and Aquinas are not wholly reconcilable.

The fact is that Aquinas, being grounded in the Christian conception of God, was compelled to find some place in his scheme for the Christian doctrine of the immanence of God. For a great part of his system he depends, as we have seen, on the Aristotelian method. The existence of God must be demonstrated and that demonstration can only be effective if it is based upon the existence of the things of experience. Thus, in the first three of his Five Ways, Thomas uses variant forms of the cosmological argument, employing all the resources of Aristotelian physics to prove, like his master, the existence of the first unmoved mover. In the First Way, attention is centred on *motus*, which may be best understood as change in general as distinct from locomotion in particular. Any change presupposes an agency which brings it about, and this agency is itself under the influence of another agent. Such a series of agencies cannot be infinite, for that would imply that the process was without a ground. Thus it is essential that there be a first unmoved mover, an agent not subject to change, but the primary source of all changes.

The Second Way uses the fact of causation in similar manner, concluding to an uncaused cause. The Third Way proceeds from the notions of necessity and contingency, and Aquinas adopts the suggestion of Maimonides that if everything were capable of non-existence then there would be a time when nothing existed, and therefore nothing could ever come to exist. He then takes account of Avicenna's distinction between a derivatively necessary existent and a being necessary of itself. If the former exist they must finally derive their existence



and their necessity from a being which is necessary of itself. Thus, without discussing its nature, Aquinas arrives at the existence of an unchanging, uncaused, and intrinsically necessary being. The Fourth and Fifth Ways are supplementary to the first three. The Fourth argues from the observable degrees of being in the world to the existence of an absolute supreme being. The Fifth Way enunciates the familiar teleological argument concluding to an intelligence which governs the world.

Here, then, in characteristically Aristotelian fashion Aquinas claims to have proved the existence of unchanging, uncaused, necessary being. But it is when he goes on to expound the notion of being itself that we see the distinctive contribution of Thomism. Contingent beings, Thomas maintains, participate in existence, but they are not their own existence. If their essence included their existence they would be necessary, not contingent. In necessary being, essence is identical with existence, and there is thus no metaphysical tension. Necessary being is being itself and pure act: it comprises all that being positively can be. 'Since God is subsistent being itself, nothing of the perfection of being can be wanting in Him. The perfections of all things are contained in the perfection of being, for things are perfect in so far as they possess a degree of being; whence it follows that God does not lack the perfection of anything.'

Here, of course, Aquinas repudiates the ontological argument, which would argue from the mere notion of infinite being to its necessary existence. By applying the causal principle to the facts of experience he proves that a necessary being exists and must therefore, as pure being, be infinite.

Such a being must be unique, all perfections subsisting in him. He is, therefore, the supreme intelligence and will, and in consequence supremely personal. This is the God of the Hebrew-Christian revelation, He who is. It is this being whom Aquinas posits as the supreme cause of the universe, whose essence is a pure act of existing. And it is here that we see the difference between Aquinas and his master. For Aristotle the emphasis is always upon reason, often in isolation from the other aspects of nature. The good life is the life according to reason; the unmoved mover is actually thought thinking itself. So that, in the Aristotelian scheme every other attribute of deity is reduced to thought. God is a pure act in the order of knowing, not in the order of existence. But in the Christian Scheme the first name of God is Being, 'and that is why we can refuse to Being neither thought, nor will, nor power, and why the attributes of the Christian God overflow the attributes of Aristotle's in every direction'.<sup>4</sup> The perfection of this infinite being transcends our finite conceptions, but as we have analogical knowledge of being so we have analogical knowledge of God. As infinite subsistent being, God is the source of all that is finite being, and therefore the creator of all things, even of *materia prima*. Here is a clear denial, by Aquinas, of Aristotle's doctrine that the world has existed eternally. It exists, says Thomas, by reason of the divine fiat, and created things do not necessarily share in the eternity of the creator. They exist in the manner appointed to them by God, and consequently it is plausible to hold that the created world had a beginning. But Aquinas does not say that this can be demonstrated philosophically. On the contrary he holds that creation belongs to the sphere of divine freedom of choice, not that of demonstrative reason. It

<sup>4</sup> Etienne Gilson, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

is a truth of revelation, and it is this concept of revelation which plays so important a part in medieval thought and in the Thomist system in particular.

#### THOMISM AND REVELATION

The medieval thinkers were fully aware of the contrast presented by the concepts of reason and revelation, and they were quite clear as to their respective merits. Revelation claimed priority. Augustine may be cited as the first to clarify the issue with any force. The whole of his thinking is dominated by the conviction that revelation precedes reason; it is an indispensable condition of understanding. In Isaiah 7<sup>9</sup> his old Latin Bible gave him a text which completely expressed his meaning: *Nisi credideritis non intelligetis*—Unless you believe you will not understand. It is a statement which sums up the medieval Christian view of the relation between reason and revelation. Anselm echoed Augustine when, in the first chapter of his *Proslogian*, he stated the purpose which prompted his work. 'For I do not seek to understand in order that I may believe, but I believe in order that I may understand. For this also I believe—that unless I believed I should not understand.' His concern is to show that though the conclusions of revelation must be accepted without question, it is the duty of reason to discover how they might have been arrived at *a priori*. Thus, in *Cur Deus Homo*, Chapter 1, he says: 'Just as the right order of going requires that we should believe the deep things of Christian faith before we presume to subject them to rational discussion, so it also seems to me negligence not to do our best, after we are confirmed in faith, to understand what we believe.'

Clearly, Anselm desires to achieve a demonstration which will satisfy the intellect. He acknowledges his debt to revelation but he intends to see that it is reduced to the smallest possible dimensions. For he holds that the truths of revelation are not intrinsically beyond the grasp of human intelligence. Unaided reason may not be able to reach them fully, but once the light of revelation is afforded, then reason can readily discern how near she was to discovering them by her own efforts. It is at this point that Aquinas parts company with Anselm. Each of them would have agreed with their predecessor John Scotus Erigena when he asserted that there can be no real contradiction between reason and revelation: 'Let no authority ever scare you out of the conclusions to which reason, after sound reflection, leads you. For true authority never opposes sound reason, nor sound reason true authority, inasmuch as, beyond a doubt, they both flow from a single source, to wit, the divine wisdom.'

But whereas Erigena took his stand on the priority of reason both Anselm and Aquinas hold to the necessity of revelation having pride of place. Here, however, their agreement ends. For Aquinas refuses to admit that the truths of revelation are accessible to reason in its own strength. On the contrary, he maintains that they are outside the range of all human faculties. They may be received, and they are certainly not inconsistent with reason, but they cannot be proved by reason.

Where, then, is this revelation to be found? Aquinas answers: In the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. They afford the illumination which man,

<sup>9</sup> *De Divisione Naturae*, 1.66.

by his nature and constitution, demands. Thomas reaches this conclusion by means of a system founded on Aristotle. He takes Aristotle's teleology, which asserts that things can only be understood when we know for what goal they are making, and builds on it a principle. This principle lays down that since all things proceed from God they are directed by Him to an end connatural to themselves. From this principle Aquinas argues that only the vision of God Himself can satisfy man. He concedes that the philosopher can reason his way to the existence of a first cause and discover something of the nature of that first cause's dealings with man. Such knowledge he held had been rationally achieved but by only a few, and such few had been blessed with leisure and aptitude to think long and seriously. How then fare the vast majority, Thomas asks, who have not these benefits? Is knowledge of God to be denied them? Assuredly not. They are provided for by the revelation which God Himself deigns to give to all, and without contradicting human reason, thus enhances the range of man's apprehension. In *Contra Gentiles* (Book I, ch. 6) he asserts the claim of the Scriptures to be this necessary revelation: 'Our faith rests upon the revelation made to the Apostles and Prophets who wrote the canonical books, and not upon the revelation made, if such there were, to any other teacher.'

The adequacy of this revelation, he claims, is attested by numerous signs: miraculous signs; the inspiration of ordinary people with eloquence and wisdom, in fulfilment of prophecy; the acceptance of the faith thus revealed by multitudes of people, despite persecution.

But however manfully he may contend for the primacy of Scripture, Thomas actually bases his argument on another authority. He is aware, as was Augustine, that the Scriptures need interpreting and he has no hesitation in interpreting them, where necessary in accordance with his own presuppositions. Not that these presuppositions were the product of his own genius. On the contrary they were the conclusions reached by the Church and habitually used by Aquinas. In *Summa Theologica* (IIa-IIae) he gives the judgement explicitly: 'Belief in all the articles of faith is clenched by one single clasp, namely, the primal truth set before us in the Scriptures, as rightly understood in accordance with the teaching of the Church.'

But, as Wicksteed shows, there are numerous occasions when Thomas assumes the validity of the Church's authority without realizing that he is so doing. Early training and that lack of critical principles in relation to the Scriptures which was typical of the medieval student, induced in Aquinas an attitude which, despite his powerful analytical mind, blinded him to the real nature of his defect: 'The voice to which the reason of Aquinas bowed its head in humble submission came to him echoed by the Scriptures, but it issued from the Church. Yet his own belief is firm and genuine that he is submitting primarily to the Scripture and only consequentially to the Church.'

Yet even here we have not reached the final basis of authority for Aquinas. With all the medieval thinkers he declares that the authority of the Scriptures is derived from God Himself. But when we ask how our assurance of that authority is reached he answers that it is given by the operation of divine grace in the human soul. The believer is induced to accept the revelation of Scripture, not merely by miraculous evidences, or by the tradition of the Church,

<sup>1</sup> P. H. Wicksteed, *Reactions between Dogma and Philosophy*, p. 175.

but also by the inward prompting of God who invites him to believe. It is indeed this action of God in inspiring man to accept the divine revelation which constitutes the chief wonder. 'That the minds of mortal beings should assent to such things is both the greatest of miracles and the evident work of divine inspiration.'

Thus, for Aquinas, faith is always a supernatural virtue, since the revelation which is accepted by faith must be supernaturally authenticated before it can be accepted. Here then are the elements of the Thomist synthesis. On the one hand there is the ready acceptance of the Greek tradition which argued for the existence of God and asserted that this truth cannot be known until it is established rationally. The laws of reason were, for Thomas, the laws of God, who also gave the biblical revelation. There could never be, therefore, a conflict between faith and reason. The Aristotelian categories led to a natural knowledge which was permanently true. By means of it, and without the illumination of the Christian faith, there could even be achieved a knowledge of God as He who is. Reason without revelation is still reason, and if it is true to itself it can still think rationally. So Thomas held and the effect was to establish the complete autonomy of reason. The logical outcome of this step was later to be seen in the work of the Deists, when they yielded up to reason the whole sphere of man's possible knowledge of God, so that revelation became merely a republication of the truths of natural religion.

On the other hand there is the biblical tradition to which, as a Christian, Thomas was committed. It is of the essence of that tradition that any recognition of truth by man is due to the self-movement of God toward mankind, resulting in the self-disclosure which Christians call revelation. In expounding this tradition Augustine, for example, held that without revelation reason cannot function, for faith is the lamp of reason. Aquinas, as we have seen, maintained that there is a sphere in which 'unaided' reason can travel quite a long way in its own strength. It was in this belief that he accepted the challenge to fight on the newly rediscovered Aristotelian ground, and undertook to show that autonomous reason could reach a true natural knowledge of God and the world. At first sight this might seem to be a rejection of the classical Biblical and Christian position. But closer examination shows Aquinas admitting that without revelation reason can give us little that can be called the knowledge of God, and no knowledge at all of His saving purpose for the world. He insists that even our natural knowledge 'is instilled into us by God since God Himself is the author of our nature' (*Contra Gentiles*, Book I, ch. 7). Further, he admits that revelation does in fact act as a signpost to reason. He was too faithful a disciple of Augustine to believe completely in unaided reason. 'Mankind would remain in the deepest darkness of ignorance if the path of reason were the only available way to the knowledge of God' (*ibid.*, I. 4). And he points to three reasons why the attainment of truth by reason alone is impracticable. First, because many men are too stupid, or too busy, or too lazy, to gather the fruits of reason. Secondly, since a true philosophy requires years of study to achieve, only a few elderly people would ever acquire it. Finally, there is that weakness of intellect, common to all men, which prevents them knowing, apart from revelation, truths which are discoverable by reason. 'Therefore it was necessary that definite certainty and pure truth about divine things should be offered to man

by the way of faith. Accordingly the divine clemency has made this salutary commandment, that even some things which reason is able to investigate must be held by faith: so that all may share in the knowledge of God easily, and without doubt or error' (ibid.).

Plainly, despite his devotion to reason, Thomas cannot resist the Christian conviction that for revelation there must be reserved the sole custody of our highest and saving knowledge of God. And it is this revelation which for Thomas is decisive and final. Without denying the validity of reason, the biblical tradition asserts the primacy of God's self-disclosure. God is He who is, the supreme cause of the universe, and in that universe all that is worthy of the name 'being' derives from Him. Such an existential world can be caused only by a supremely existential God.

'By positing, as the supreme cause of all that which is, somebody who is, and of whom the very best that can be said is that "He is", Christian revelation was establishing existence as the deepest layer of reality as well as the supreme attribute of the divinity.'<sup>1</sup> And in so doing it was insisting that God is not only transcendent but also immanent. Thomas expresses it concisely in a sentence of *De Veritate* (qu.22, art.2, ad. 1m): 'All knowing beings implicitly know God in any and everything that they know.'

A. JOHN BADCOCK

<sup>1</sup> Etienne Gilson, *God and Philosophy*, p. 43.

## SWINE, SOUND, AND SANITY

COMMENTATORS on the story of the Gergesene demoniac have generally been relieved to see the last of the herd of swine fling themselves down the steep place into the sea. Their presence in the story is an awkward intrusion. Branscomb makes explicit what all seem to feel: 'It is difficult to bring the part of the swine into relationship with the purposes and procedures of Jesus.'<sup>1</sup>

Whatever the attitude of the commentator toward the historicity of the incident, toward demon-possession, or toward *Mark's* theological treatment of his material, he makes the fate of the swine the centre of his discussion. In 1896, Plummer, summing up previous discussion, states that 'the real difficulties in the miracle for those who believe in the fact of demoniacal possession, are connected with the swine'.<sup>2</sup> He passes lightly over the question of the possibility of purely spiritual beings influencing those which are purely animal, and concentrates on the property issue which Huxley and Gladstone had debated in 1891: 'How can we justify the destruction of the swine, which were innocent creatures and which belonged to persons who do not seem to have merited such a heavy loss?' He lists the nine explanations that up till then had been

<sup>1</sup> B. Harvie Branscomb, *Mark* (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary), p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> *St Luke* (I.C.C.), p. 228.



offered. These are that (1) the whole story is a myth; (2) the healing is historical, the incident of the swine a later addition; (3) the demoniac<sup>3</sup> frightened the swine, and the transfer of the demons was imagined; (4) the drowning was an accident, simultaneous with the healing; (5) the demoniac was a madman whom Jesus cured by humouring his fancies about demons and their habits; (6) the destruction, like natural convulsions, is part of the mystery of evil and therefore insoluble; (7) Christ, as Creator, had the right to do as he pleased with his own; (8) the demoniac could not believe he was cured unless he saw a definite effect of the demons' expulsion; (9) the loss was a divine punishment of the swine's owners for breaking the Jewish law in keeping them. From these nine explanations, commentators still take their choice.

Most modern commentators have themselves given up the demons, but leave them to the madman, and so usually favour what Archbishop Trench in 1874 scarified as 'merely ridiculous and irreconcilable with the documents as they lie before us';<sup>4</sup> that is, the third explanation in Plummer's list, obtaining a version of the incident of which the first chapter in *By an Unknown Disciple* (1918) is the fullest and most picturesque example.<sup>5</sup> Branscomb may be quoted as representative: 'If [the part about the swine] be regarded as historical, one would naturally explain it as a misinterpretation on the part of the disciples. A herd of swine feeding on a slope might easily be stampeded by a maniac who runs shrieking and waving his arms in their direction, and the disciples would certainly have regarded the rush over the cliff as due to the demons which had just been expelled.'

So, this awkward incident satisfactorily explained, commentators rarely pause to consider *the effect on the madman of the stampede of the swine*, for that their flight played its part in the cure the story plainly implies.<sup>6</sup> Those who do consider this question generally deal with it by accepting the explanation eighth in Plummer's list.

## I

This traditional interpretation is (in Plummer's words) that 'a *visible* effect of the departure of the demons was necessary to convince the demoniacs (*sic*) of the completeness of the cure'.<sup>7</sup>

It is found in Trench: 'It may have been necessary for the permanent healing of the man that he should have *outward evidence* and testimony that the hellish powers which held him in bondage have quitted their hold . . . as Israel coming out of Egypt must *see* the Egyptians dead upon the seashore before they could indeed believe that the rod of their oppressors had been broken for ever.'

<sup>3</sup> Plummer follows *Matthew's* version and refers to two demoniacs throughout.

<sup>4</sup> *On the Miracles*, p. 182.

<sup>5</sup> See David Smith, *The Disciples' Commentary* (1928), pp. 155f.; Manson, *Luke* (Moffatt), (1930), p. 96; Weatherhead, *It Happened in Palestine* (1936), pp. 73ff.; Branscomb, *Mark* (Moffatt), (1937), p. 92; Findlay, *The Gospel According to St Luke* (1937), pp. 102-3; Alington, *The New Testament* (1938), p. 122.

<sup>6</sup> A word may here be said about the doubt which has been cast on the historicity of the incident. The doubt takes its rise in the commentator's own prejudices, and has no evidence in its support. Vincent Taylor, in *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, pp. 123-5, expresses his conviction that this is one of six narratives 'which stand nearer [than other miracle-stories] to the original accounts'. Even Branscomb admits that 'as it stands . . . the narrative is a good story which should not be spoiled'.

<sup>7</sup> *Italics mine*, as also in the quotations from Trench, Smith, and Findlay.

David Smith prefaces his account of the incident with the story of the experience which gave Sir James Wylie his position as Court physician to the Tsar Alexander the First, and which, he says, 'aptly' illustrates the miracle. The old Tsar, Paul the First, had the insane idea that a bee had entered his ear and was lodged in his brain. The young Wylie, recently landed at Kronstadt and appealed to by the Tsar's courtiers, effected a cure by means of a real bee he had obtained and some hocus-pocus with the royal ear. With unconscious *naïveté*, Professor Smith continues: 'It was *precisely* so that the demoniac's delusion was dispelled.' When he saw the startled pigs disappear, he knew that he was dispossessed. 'He was sure of it: for *had he not seen it with his own eyes.*' So also in Findlay: 'The man, *seeing* the swine go, and hearing the splashes, would be convinced that the legion was gone, and was restored.'

That this interpretation of the way in which the stampede of the swine assisted in the cure has much to commend it, its acceptance by scholars of such repute implies, yet it involves certain difficulties. It means that the demons had left the man before the flight of the swine, that the rout followed the cure. If he were cured by Jesus before the pigs ran, why should his gesticulations be regarded as the cause of the stampede? The narrative implies that there is a closer connexion than that between the cure and the wild flight, indeed that the one could not have taken place without the other. But more than that: in concentrating on the problems of the demons and the swine, commentators have tended to overlook the man. Who he was we shall never know; but there are questions we must ask about him. Why, on seeing Jesus, did the cry 'Torment me not' break from him? Why should the word 'Legion' have come in answer to the question: 'What is thy name?' In what way did he conceive of his terrible state that a simple question should compel such a surprising answer? In what circumstances had he been bound with fetters and chains? Not until these questions are at least asked can we begin to fit the rout of the swine into its proper place as an effective part of the cure. It may well be objected that no certain answer is possible to any of them, but as they are raised by the narrative itself they merit consideration.

## II

Most commentators meticulously point out that a Legion was a company of some five to six thousand Roman infantry, and that the use of the term by the madman reveals his belief that many demons possessed his soul. So, in Branscomb: 'He was confident that he was possessed by many demons and accordingly called himself Legion.' Here they are following the text, but if this is all it means, either on Mark's pen or on that of the commentators, then here we have one of the superbest known examples of understatement.

Commentators will question the historicity of the incident but fail to wonder at the contradiction in the madman's interpretation of his hyperbole. How much more probable is it that it was Mark and not the madman who added 'for we are many', himself becoming his own first commentator.

With the idea of number in his mind also, W. F. Adeney dismisses the word with an, 'of course, it would be absurd to speculate on a maniac's arithmetic'.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *St Luke* (Century Bible), p. 161.

A. E. J. Rawlinson is facetious: 'It does not follow that we are to think of six thousand demons; it is more in the spirit of the narrative to suppose that there were about two thousand, one for each of the swine!'<sup>9</sup>

All this is beside the point. There is no attempt to appreciate the inwardness of the demoniac's experience. None asks how what he regarded as possession by a Legion of demons *felt* to the madman. His delusion was real enough, no matter what we now think of the existence of demons. Was not the cutting of himself with stones an attempt (such as might be paralleled in India today) to provide an exit for them? In what way did they reveal their presence within him? To think in terms of number is an evasion of the real issue.

Two recent writers have taken the term as something more than an index of quantity. Both Findlay and Weatherhead attempt an interpretation of the incident from the standpoint of modern psychology. Both presuppose that the trouble was the outcome of a fright experienced in early childhood, connected in some way with a Roman Legion. Weatherhead fancifully suggests that the man as a child might have witnessed the Massacre of the Innocents, and builds up a harrowing picture of brutality, blood and fear working on a sensitive child with a weak family mental history; but this is theory pressing history into its service. What the man did between the original shock and his appearance in the tombs of Gergesa is a blank that even Weatherhead's imagination makes no attempt to fill. Nor, rightly, does Findlay, who continues: 'But when he began to call himself "Legion" and imitate the legion "on the kill" his fellow-villagers had him taken away to this lonely place, chained up [but who took him away and chained him up?] and left to perish.' He sees the man's mind imprisoned in a circle of ideas—the legion, the swine (associated by the fact that Roman soldiers ate pork and the pig was the favourite home of unclean spirits), and the water at the foot of the cliff, the one way open to the demons back to the underworld. The drowning of the swine, startled by his cries, broke the circle. He had driven the demons back to the underworld!

In the question of Jesus, Weatherhead sees the meaning: What was the original blow or shock which led to this condition? 'He doesn't give his name, as he would have done had the question meant no more than it appears to mean.'<sup>10</sup> He says at once "Legion". . . . I cannot avoid the conclusion that the man is giving the origin of his shock. Years ago, probably in childhood, the time when those traumas which later cause such devastating havoc in a mind are usually sustained, he had been, I imagine, terrified out of his mind by the deeds of a Roman legion.' Weatherhead points out that when the original shock which has caused mental unbalance is recovered to consciousness, there is often a violent abreaction or display of emotion. 'Now imagine the man who said "Legion", screaming and running about, or jumping into the air, as he is sure to have done if a psychological abreaction occurred. Is it any wonder that the pigs, grazing quietly near, got into a panic and rushed into the sea?' The demoniac 'accepts the view that the devils have gone into the swine'.

According to Weatherhead, the stampede of the swine had no integral part in the healing of the man; he scarcely reckons with the fact that the man himself *believed* he was possessed with demons. The connexion is made in Findlay's

<sup>9</sup> *St Mark* (Westminster Commentary), p. 63.

<sup>10</sup> Weatherhead does not take into account the use of the 'name' in exorcism.

theory but, as we have seen, he accepts the traditional view, the 'visual' theory. Though Weatherhead believes that the man received in childhood the shock that issued in madness, the two illustrations which he uses to support the credibility of his interpretation are of men whose insanity resulted from shock received in *manhood* during the Great War. Psychology has too many instances of the results of a shock received in childhood later issuing in madness to make this an argument fatal to his theory, but it does suggest that the origin of a mental condition of the kind seen in the demoniac need not be looked for only in a childhood experience.

I suggest that the answer 'Legion', the fetters and chains and the cry 'Torment me not' point to one particular situation—confinement and cruel treatment in a Roman camp or barracks, and that the stampede of the swine contributed to the demoniac's cure not because he *saw* the swine running, but because he *heard* them.

### III

There is nothing to suggest that the man was a native of the small town or village near which the tombs lay. Indeed, *Luke's* words, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, and his proclaiming his cure throughout the Decapolis, suggest that Gergesa (Kheresa) had little immediate interest for him. What was the extent of the power and influence of Rome on both sides of the Jordan? Had the madman had opportunity of coming into contact with Roman legionaries?

The word 'Legion' according to Barnes in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible* 'was not a familiar one to the inhabitants of Palestine in New Testament times, for the legions were stationed in the frontier provinces, and nothing happened to bring them into Judaea until the outbreak of the Jewish war in A.D. 66'. The word, he points out, is 'rare (if it occurs at all) in Josephus', who translates *Legio* by τάγμα throughout. Its absence from Josephus is inadequate proof that it was not known, and it can scarcely be maintained that the legions themselves (or cohorts of those legions) were strangers to Palestine, as they certainly were not strangers to Syria, until A.D. 66.

When in 63 B.C. Pompey entered Palestine, he recognized the Maccabean kingdom, but freed the Greek cities of Palestine from its rule. Of these the inland cities listed by Josephus include Hippos, Scythopolis, Pella, and Dion, members together with Gadara (which Pompey had rebuilt) of the Decapolis. These Greek cities Pompey joined to the province of Syria, 'which Province . . . together with Judaea and the countries as far as Egypt and Euphrates, he committed to Scaurus as their governor, and gave him two legions to support him'.<sup>11</sup> Though the government of this region was carried on largely by the agency of vassal princes and autonomous cities, over the whole area Rome exercised supervision; and always in the background of the subsequent history of Galilee, Judaea, and the Decapolis, are the legions that were stationed in Syria. While undoubtedly many of the cohorts that appeared in Palestine were 'of new-raised men, gathered out of Syria'<sup>12</sup> and therefore *auxilia*, of the presence of four Legions in Syria in A.D. 23 there is definite evidence.<sup>13</sup> The

<sup>11</sup> Josephus, *I Wars*, VII.7.

<sup>12</sup> *ibid.*, XVII.1.

<sup>13</sup> See T. R. S. Broughton, *Art, 'The Roman Army', Beginnings*, V.427f.; H. M. Parker, *The Roman Legions*, p. 119.

Legio VI Ferrata was stationed at Apamea. The Legio III Gallica was part of Antony's Parthian army of sixty thousand men, and was taken over by Augustus after Actium and stationed in Syria at Raphanea, where was also the camp of the Legio XII Fulminata which came from Egypt. The Legio X Fretensis was sent to Syria 'probably before A.D. 6 and certainly by A.D. 17 when it was encamped at Cyrrhae'<sup>14</sup> on the Antioch—Zeugma road. Syria was garrisoned by four legions not so much because of the Parthian menace as to secure the flank of Egypt and, with Egypt, the corn supply of Rome.

From Pompey till the days of Christ, we find both the Legions and Auxilia in constant movement: driving the Nabateans to the southern edge of Hauran; keeping the Parthians in check by constant vigilance and large-scale expeditions; their infantry and cavalry raising the dust of Judean roads to exact tribute or to assist Herod in establishing his authority; setting up their ensigns outside Jerusalem where they were encamped 'as a guard to the kingdom'; under Varus burning and plundering their way through Galilee, leaving a forest of crosses behind them, assisted in their brutal work by Arabian auxiliaries; occupying Caesarea on the reduction of Judaea to a Roman province; their standards marching with Pontius Pilate to the profanation of the Holy City, where at the festivals a Roman guard stood ready, to maintain order and anticipate sedition; and to the Lake itself (whoever composed the cohort in Capernaum) sending its centurions.

Beyond the Lake the Greek cities of the Decapolis remained attached to the Province of Syria until 31 B.C. when, with others, Hippos and Gadara were bestowed on Herod by Augustus, with Trachonitis, Batanea, and the country of Auranitis; but on the division of the kingdom in 4 B.C. Gaza, Gadara, and Hippos were put under the Roman governor of Syria. Hippos, on the main road from Damascus to Judaea is no more than six miles from Kersa; Gadara little more than twice that distance. George Adam Smith tells us how among the tombs of Gadara he saw the 'recently excavated' gravestone of a soldier of the Fourteenth Legion. 'As I read this last detail—and the word is still stamped on other stones in the neighbourhood—I realized how familiar that engine of foreign oppression had been to this region.'<sup>15</sup> And, though these tombstones may belong to a period later than the life of Christ, it would be strange if, in all that coming and going of Rome in Palestine and Syria, the word *Legion* had not fallen with tragic iteration on vassal ears.

#### IV

The evidence from language, while far from decisive, lends support to the conjecture of official imprisonment. Both *Mark* and *Luke* use the words πῆδη and ἄλυσις in describing the man's bonds. Lightfoot, in *Philippians*, commenting on ἄλυσις says: 'The word seems originally to differ from δεσμοί only as bringing out the idea of *attachment* rather than *confinement*. Afterwards however it signifies especially 'hand-fetters' (*manicae*) as opposed to πῆδαι (*pedicae*). . . . Hence the word is used especially of the "coupling chain", "handcuff", by which the prisoner was attached to his guard. . . .' In general, in the New Testament where it is used we find it associated with soldiers and official imprisonment.

<sup>14</sup> Broughton, *op. cit.*, p. 434; Parker, *op. cit.*, pp. 265ff.

<sup>15</sup> G. A. Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (26th edn), p. 461.



Δεσμῶν and φύλασσω do not carry with them any particular suggestion of prisons or soldiers.

While there are many references to madness in both Greek and Latin literature, there are few to restraint; and it is unlikely, on the face of it, that a madman would be chained to a soldier's wrist. Yet does not the fact of his fetters raise questions like these: Where was he put under restraint? In his own home? On whose authority? By the hands of relatives and friends? Are fetters and chains part of the impedimenta of an ordinary household? The background of the whole incident is tantalizingly obscure; yet these questions, coupled with the ideas contained in the words *δλυσις* and *πέδη* suggest an official imprisonment and not a family restraint.

V

How was he treated in his madness? So bitterly that his first feeling on seeing men is one of terror at the imminence of new punishment and agony. However *Mark* has interpreted it, the cry 'Torment me not' is one of the most human in the Bible. Madmen are objects of terror and, until recently, they were considered fair game for anyone who cared to torment them. The cry of old Mr Fawkes at the name 'Bedlam' (in D. L. Murray's novel '*Trumpeter, Sound!*') in the 1850's, might well have come from the Gergesene demoniac: 'You haven't brought me to this place to leave me *there*, have you? . . . They would chain me up, whip me like a wild beast! . . . I used to go with your mother on Sunday afternoons to look at them. How the crowd laughed when they drenched them with icy water!'

How or when the madness first showed itself in the demoniac we do not know, but that he was confirmed in it (if it was not actually brought on) by the brutal treatment he received from the Roman soldiery where he was chained up we can readily believe. And what mad whirl filled his disordered mind: chained in captivity, an object of fear and derision, subject to the harsh treatment of the soldiers, lying in the dark listening to shouted commands, the clang of arms, the sound of many feet clattering on hard pavements, the insistent noise of marching feet filling his cell with a confused uproar!<sup>16</sup> He did not *see* the Legion: he *heard* it. And did not the uproar echo and re-echo in his head till it seemed as if a legion of demons was marching there? And even in the tombs, where he had wandered when he escaped from captivity, the Legion remained with him, marching uncontrollably in his disordered brain.

On that slope above the Lake, he met with love, trust, and gentleness. There is the beginning of his cure. Its end came when the pigs began running (startled we know not how) and the noise of their running feet filled the air, mingled with those feet that rushed in incessant confusion in his head, until, going farther and farther away, the uproar grew fainter . . . and stopped. The tumult of sound was ended. And at the feet of Jesus, those who came saw the demoniac sitting, clothed and *in his right mind*.

HARRY BELSHAW

<sup>16</sup> The evocative power of footsteps is used by Dickens with telling effect in *A Tale of Two Cities*, Ch. 21. So too, D. L. Murray in '*Trumpeter, Sound!*' Describing a cavalry barracks in early Victorian days, she writes: 'Never the thump of the football or click of the bat was to be heard on field or common; only the crunch of regulated feet, the trample of horse-hoofs and jarring of guns from year's end to year's end.' I adduce these as illustrations, not evidence.

## APOCALYPTIC—SOME CURRENT DELUSIONS

A CERTAIN type of teaching known as apocalyptic is said to have arisen among the Jews in the second century B.C. and to have continued for three hundred years—roughly the period from Daniel to Revelation. Some accounts of this teaching, which is alleged to be vital for a true understanding of Christian origins, distinguish it from legal Judaism. According to one interpretation, the apocalyptic wing passed into the Christian Church leaving Judaism with the legal teaching which became codified in the Talmud. Many apocalypses, it is alleged, have been discovered in modern times so that now the books of Revelation and Daniel are seen to be in no way unique, but members of a large class. The apocalyptic literature is said to include such works as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Apocalypse of Baruch, Psalms of Solomon, Book of Jubilees, and 1 and 2 Enoch. Again, the teaching of this literature, especially in reference to the Messianic hope, is said to be distinctive. Thus, the 'apocalyptic' group among the Jews expected, so it is alleged, a Messiah to come out of Heaven, and as God's instrument bring in the new day.

Some of these familiar assumptions, most of which have held sway for over fifty years, I wish to challenge:

- (1) The alleged cleavage between the apocalyptic party and the legal side of Judaism;
- (2) the extent of the literature which may legitimately be described as apocalyptic;
- (3) the suggested period over which this kind of literature extended; and
- (4) the alleged peculiarities of its teaching.

It will be maintained here that an apocalypse is a recognizable literary form; but that the clearly marked distinctiveness of its teaching is open to doubt, as is the existence of an apocalyptic party.

The word 'apocalypse' means an unveiling; it may be an unveiling of the unseen world, as in Dante's *Commedia*, or it may be an unveiling of the future, as in Daniel. The latter sense is the one which attaches itself to the Messianic hope. This unveiling of the future, this attempt to forecast coming events in detail, was often but not always set out in symbolic form. Thus in Daniel and Revelation the kingdoms of the world are represented as beasts: 'The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings' (Daniel 7<sup>4</sup>); 'And I saw a beast coming up out of the sea, having ten horns and seven heads' (Revelation 13<sup>1</sup>). At times the detailed forecast of the future dispenses with the use of this kind of imagery. Thus in the Gospels the Little Apocalypse (Mark 13) makes no reference to bears or leopards but speaks of nations and wars in plain terms, although the phrase 'abomination of desolation' is somewhat cryptic and comes, of course, from Daniel. Again, the following passage from the Talmud is an apocalypse, a detailed forecast of the future:

Our Rabbis taught: In the seven year cycle at the end of which the son of David will come—in the first year, this verse will be fulfilled: And I will cause it to rain upon one city and cause it not to rain upon another city (Amos 4<sup>7</sup>); in the second, the arrows of hunger will be sent forth; in the third, a great famine, in the course of

which men, women, and children, pious men and saints will die, and the Torah will be forgotten by its students; in the fourth, partial plenty; in the fifth, great plenty, when men will eat, drink, and rejoice, and the Torah will return to its disciples; in the sixth, [Heavenly] sounds; [a footnote on this word reads: Either Heavenly voices announcing the advent of Messiah, or the blasts of the great Shofar; cf. Isaiah 27<sup>13</sup>]; in the seventh, wars; and at the conclusion of the septennate the son of David will come (*Sanhedrin* 97a).<sup>1</sup>

This passage shows how absurd it is to distinguish legal Judaism from the Messianic hope. In this particular tractate (*Sanhedrin*) and in others there is a good deal of eschatology, and numerous references occur to the Messiah's coming, his kingdom and the future world. According to William Sanday (*The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, 1907),

Two distinct streams are observable in Jewish thought about the Christian era: on the one hand there were the apocalypses, which are now seen to have been far more important and more widely diffused than had been supposed; on the other hand there was the legal teaching based upon the study and application of the Mosaic Law, which we associate with the Pharisees as they are described for us in the Gospels, the same type of teaching that at a later date was embodied in the Talmud (p. 49).

Now this, I submit, is a false antithesis. The Pharisees and the legalists did not confine themselves to ethics and legal enactments and matters of conduct. In fact the Pharisees were specially identified with the doctrines of resurrection and the future life. Some of the works which are normally described as apocalyptic were written by Pharisees! The Book of Jubilees, says R. H. Charles (*Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II. 1), was written by a Pharisee. It is a 'triumphant manifesto of legalism'. The Psalms of Solomon are themselves 'the work of one or more of the Pharisees' (p. 630). The Assumption of Moses was written by 'a Pharisaic Quietist. He was a Pharisee of a fast-disappearing type, recalling in all respects the Chasid of the early Maccabean times, and upholding the old traditions of quietude and resignation' (p. 411). The Apocalypse of Baruch was 'written by Pharisaic Jews as an apology for Judaism, and in part an implicit polemic against Christianity'. In his separate commentary on 1 Enoch, Charles says concerning Chapters 91-104: 'The author belongs to a clearly defined party. That this party is the Pharisees is obvious.' One cannot help being puzzled by such statements; having first been told that the apocalyptic wing must be distinguished from the legalistic wing we then learn that some of the apocalyptic writings were written by Pharisees.

When we examine the particular books which are usually described as apocalyptic literature the mystery deepens. This is the kind of statement which has become familiar in the past half century. Again it will be useful to quote from the same work of Sanday:

Between the time of the Maccabean rising and the rising under Barcochba, the last convulsive effort of the Jewish state in A.D. 132-5, there appeared a whole series of apocalypses one after the other—the Book of Enoch, the Psalms of Solomon, the Assumption of Moses, the Book of Jubilees, the Ascension of Isaiah, probably the original of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the so-called Fourth Ezra, the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Book of the Secrets of Baruch (p. 47).

<sup>1</sup> Sencino edition.

It should be noted that these works are described as apocalypses, 'a whole series of apocalypses'. Let us examine one or two of them.

I have before me as I write the Book of Jubilees. It is sometimes known as Little Genesis and it is a Midrash on Genesis and the early chapters of Exodus. As Charles justly says: 'As the Chronicler had rewritten the history of Israel and Judah from the basis of the Priests' Code, so our author re-edited from the Pharisaic standpoint of his time the history of events from the creation to the publication, or, according to the author's view, the republication of the law on Sinai.' There are fifty chapters in all. The early ones describe the creation and the story of the patriarchs. In Chapter 11 we have got as far as Abraham, whose story occupies us up to Chapter 23. We then continue with Isaac and Jacob up to 38; from 39 the narrative is concerned with Joseph, and his death is reached in 46. In the following chapter Moses is born, the last four chapters being concerned with him and the laws transmitted through him; thus the final chapter (50) has to do with laws regarding the jubilees (verses 1-5) and the Sabbath (verses 6-13). One feature of the book is the way in which the Mosaic law is traced back to patriarchal observance; e.g. in 15<sup>1</sup> Abraham celebrates the feast of the first-fruits.

The book is thus a re-writing of the past. It is true that a few references are made to the Messianic kingdom, though only one verse mentions the Messiah (31<sup>1\*</sup>), and even this is doubtful since the reference may be to David, the son of Jesse. The main drift of the book is as stated; it is a re-writing, from the legalistic standpoint, of the book of Genesis. It is difficult to see how such a work belongs to the same category as Revelation and Daniel—it is not primarily a detailed forecast of the future. It is strange that anyone who has read or perused it can describe it as an apocalypse.

Another work designated by Sanday, Charles, and others, as an apocalypse is the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. This is, in the main, an ethical treatise. Each of the twelve sons of Jacob gives instructions and advice to his sons before his death. In some of the testaments, though not in all, brief references to the future occur. The first testament is that of Reuben. It has seven chapters: the first gives Reuben's confession and repentance; we then continue with the 'Seven Spirits of Deceit'; Reuben's sin; a Warning against sin; an Exhortation to obey Levi; and the testament closes with Reuben's death and burial. There is no description of the Messianic future, detailed or otherwise. Some of the testaments do contain references to a blessed earthly future, sometimes with Christian interpolations, but the subject is not dwelt upon and such passages consist usually of a few verses (see Dan 5<sup>10-12</sup>; Benjamin 11<sup>2-4</sup>; Levi 18). There is no predictive element of this kind in Issachar or Asher. Naphtali has two verses, 8<sup>2-3</sup>, but here Christian interpolation is likely ('through their tribes shall God appear dwelling among men on earth'). These passages are small in bulk compared with the rest and it is strange indeed to describe this ethical treatise as an apocalypse. If any work which contains eschatological references is to be called an apocalypse, then Augustine's *Confessions*, the Nicene Creed, and the English Hymnal are apocalypses.

Another work described as an apocalypse is the Psalms of Solomon. It proves on examination to consist of Psalms—not surprising in view of its title. Most of them are similar to the Old Testament psalms. The first is as follows:

I cried unto the Lord when I was in distress,  
 Unto God when sinners assailed.  
 Suddenly the alarm of war was heard before me;  
 (I said) He will hearken to me, for I am full of righteousness.

Two out of the eighteen Psalms mention the Messiah, numbers 17 and 18. In none of them is there any detailed forecast of the future. If the Psalms of Solomon is an apocalypse then the biblical book of Psalms is also an apocalypse.

Let us turn now to Peake's *Commentary on the Bible* which has a chapter on apocalyptic literature written by Professor H. T. Andrews (pages 431 ff.). He begins:

Some of the greatest discoveries of modern biblical criticism have been made in the field of what is known as Apocalyptic. No one can read the New Testament without being impressed by the unique character of the Book of Revelation. It seems to stand alone. There is nothing else which bears any resemblance to it at all, not only in the New Testament, but in the literature of the world. The nearest approach to it is the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament. We know now, however, that Jewish literature in the two centuries before and the century after Christ affords us many parallels to the Book of Revelation. Other Apocalypses have been discovered of a similar type. . . . (p.431).

He includes in the category of apocalyptic literature the following works: Daniel, Enoch, Secrets of Enoch, Apocalypse of Baruch, 4 Ezra, Assumption of Moses, Book of Jubilees, Ascension of Isaiah, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Book of Revelation, Apocalypse of Peter (p. 433). This list is similar to that of Sanday. How many of them, we may ask in the light of his opening sentence, are recent discoveries? Fourth Ezra (known also as 2 Esdras) has been for many years available in the appendix of the Vulgate, and has been printed both in Latin and English for centuries. It is in the English Apocrypha and is in every parish church in the country. The Psalms of Solomon were printed in 1626. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs were translated from Greek to Latin by the great English Franciscan, Grosseteste, in the thirteenth century. The Sibylline Oracles were published at Basle in 1545. It is true that the Book of Jubilees has come to light only in recent times, but, as we have seen, like some of the others it is not an apocalypse. The number of newly discovered apocalypses has been greatly exaggerated.

The period in which the apocalypses flourished is usually said to be from 200 B.C. to A.D. 100. But this is difficult to defend. Several Old Testament passages are frequently included in this category, various sections of Isaiah (13-14, 24-7, 34-5) and Ezekiel, Joel, Zechariah 9-14—do these all lie within the period stated? These perhaps can be explained as adumbrations. But nothing can excuse the date given for the close of the period. Apocalypses were produced for centuries after the time stated. The Elijah Apocalypse belongs to the third century A.D. Wünsche in the volumes of his *Kleine Midraschim* includes a number of works which are genuine apocalypses and which were produced well on in the Christian era. Some of them mention Mohammed, describing him as the camel-driver.

Perhaps the worst error of all and one with most serious consequences is the suggestion that the apocalypses present a distinctive type of Messiah. The old



prophetic conception of a son of David, a human king, stands on one side; and on the other is the apocalyptic Messiah, who descends in glory from heaven. Yet if one examines the works named in the lists we have already considered (whether strictly apocalypses or not) the following results emerge. In 1 Enoch 1-36 there is no Messiah at all; nor is there in the Assumption of Moses or in 2 Enoch. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs the Messiah comes not from the sky but from Judah (Judah 24) or from 'the tribe of Judah and of Levi' (Dan 5<sup>10-11</sup>). In the Zadokite Fragment the Messiah arises from Aaron and from Israel. In the Psalms of Solomon the Messiah is a man and nothing more, a son of David; as R. H. Charles observes in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (p. 244b): 'the writer of Psa. Sol. 17 returns to the conception of the prophets and describes him as the "Son of David" (17<sup>23</sup>)'.

These facts alone show how inaccurate it is to speak of the 'apocalyptic Messiah'. In 2 Esdras, which belongs to the end of the first century A.D., some passages imply Messiah's pre-existence and in one vision he is seen ascending from the sea. This according to Gressmann reflects a sun-myth (*Der Messias*, p. 407), an interpretation also put forward in Hans Schmidt's *Jona*. Schmidt traces the Son-of-man vision of Daniel 7 to the same origin, and explains in this way why Daniel's Son of man is represented as ascending (7<sup>13-14</sup>).

The usual practice is to take the Similitudes of Enoch, where undoubtedly the pre-existent Son of man appears as judge, and to apply this conception to the apocalyptic literature as a whole. This gives quite a wrong impression, for the teaching of Enoch is unique in Jewish literature.

The fact is that the apocalypses are distinctive in their mode of presentation rather than in their Messianic doctrines. A transcendent Messiah is not the rule in this literature. B. H. Streeter, in the famous essay which he contributed to *Foundations*, described Jesus as confronted by two alternative conceptions of Messiah. He writes of the Temptation of our Lord under the heading, 'Apocalyptic or Warrior Christ' (p. 99). 'The conception of Warrior Christ being rejected absolutely and *in toto*, there remained only the conception of the Christ to be apocalyptically manifested.'<sup>2</sup>

This use of the word 'apocalyptic' is unwarranted. Several kinds of teaching could be expressed in an apocalypse. On a further point: it is questionable if the word 'apocalyptic' as a noun is needed; it is apt to be ambiguous and misleading. The noun is 'apocalypse', and the adjective which goes with it is 'apocalyptic'; just as 'allegory' is the noun which refers to another recognized literary form, and 'allegorical' is the adjective. We do not require another noun 'allegoric'; and no more do we need the noun 'apocalyptic', a word apparently introduced by German scholars last century.

It is commonly thought that the Kingdom of God, as set forth in the teaching of Jesus, cannot be understood apart from the apocalypses. The astonishing thing is that the apocalypses do not contain the phrase! G. Dalman in his invaluable work *The Words of Jesus* (pp. 91-147) gives many illuminating examples of the use of 'the kingdom of God' in Jewish Rabbinic works, the liturgy, and the Targums; the apocalyptic literature yields scarcely any material,

<sup>2</sup> 'The Son of man was expected to appear in the sky with attendant angels' (Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 101—my italics). The Son of man appears only in Enoch 37-71; I can find nothing there or elsewhere to justify this statement.

apart from 'his kingdom' in the Assumption of Moses 10<sup>1</sup> (*parebit regnum illius*). In this connexion the word 'apocalyptic' is sometimes used to denote divine inbreaking and judgement—but these were not absent from the main prophets of the Old Testament, all of whom deal with the Day of the Lord, a conception which is older than Amos. It was not a subject which began to be noised abroad about 200 B.C. On the other hand the element of divine judgement is not always prominent in the literature we have been considering; for example, 1 Enoch 72-82, 'the book of the heavenly luminaries', is mainly about astronomy and the calendar.

It is true that there was a new element in Jewish teaching about the year 200 B.C.—this was the doctrine of the resurrection: but it shows itself in nearly all subsequent Jewish writings, not in the apocalypses alone. This is the most important factor to bear in mind, the doctrine of the resurrection, which broke up the old form of the Messianic hope. Before the emergence of this doctrine it was expected that the Messianic age would take place on the earth and former generations would not share in it. In Isaiah 65-6 for instance, it is clear that the earth is the scene of bliss; and while life is considerably prolonged, death still takes place (cf. 65<sup>20</sup>). The Messiah, so it seems in some of the older conceptions, will continue his reign indefinitely, or else there is to be a Messianic dynasty rather than a single king. Here Ezekiel is of particular interest (cf. 37<sup>25</sup>: 'and David my servant shall be their prince for ever').

It is obvious that this old form of Messianism was broken up by the conception of the resurrection. Such a shattering event divides human history into two parts far more decisively than the rise of the Messianic ruler and the beginning of an era of peace. Various ways were devised of combining this new conception of resurrection with the old Messianic hope; but the most familiar method was to say that Messiah's reign would be a limited period just prior to the resurrection. This is orthodox Jewish teaching today. A number of instances from the Talmud could be given. The period for Messiah's reign was variously given as 40 years, 70, 400, 365, 1000, and so on (cf. *Sanhedrin* 99a). Some of the apocalypses also present this kind of teaching, but not the Book of Daniel. This has no Messiah at all, no reign of limited duration; eternal conditions set in with the resurrection. Here and elsewhere the resurrection has displaced the Messiah. But the prevailing view in Judaism was that Messiah would first reign for a limited period, then would follow the resurrection and eternity. This view is found in the Psalms of Solomon; to quote R. H. Charles:

His rule is temporary (verse 42): 'He shall not faint all his days.' Only the surviving righteous share in his kingdom (17<sup>50</sup>); the departed righteous are not raised to participate in it.<sup>3</sup>

Another way of combining the Messiah and the resurrection, which might occur to anyone who reflected on the subject, would be to say that the Messiah belonged to the eternal world, the world of the resurrection. This was the scheme of 1 Enoch 37-71, which is unique in Jewish teaching.

But the prevailing doctrine is and has been that Messiah will reign on earth for a limited period. This view goes back for centuries and the Psalms of

<sup>3</sup> *Ency. Bib.*, p. 244b.

Solomon show that it had become accepted as early as the first century B.C. At no time has a transcendent Messiah been the norm.

Here I may be allowed a personal word. Some years ago when giving a Christmas address to some young people I pointed out how different the coming of Jesus was from Jewish expectations. The Jews had thought that the sky would suddenly open and Messiah would descend in glory. After giving this address I asked myself where exactly in Jewish teaching this expectation was to be found. It was soon clear to me that it was not in the Old Testament. I thought of the apocalyptic literature; yes, here must be the answer—the Old Testament gave a picture of a Davidic king, the apocalypses a glorious and heavenly figure descending in clouds. To my surprise, when I examined the alleged apocalyptic literature I found nothing corresponding to the statement I had repeated so glibly. Since then I have ceased making remarks of that kind.

It is a striking fact that for fifty years such statements have been made. Schweitzer in his *Quest of the Historical Jesus* assumes that the Davidic form of Messianic hope had been abandoned by the time when Jesus lived; it was unthinkable that the Messiah should be a man on earth. Such language is entirely unwarranted.

The opinion that our Lord derived from the Similitudes of 1 Enoch the phrase 'the Son of Man' has lost ground in recent years. Even if they were in existence at that time it is very unlikely that He had read them; His references to the Son of man can be otherwise accounted for.<sup>4</sup> But it is doubtful if the Similitudes were even in existence at the time of our Lord's life. Charles's dating is widely accepted in the English-speaking world; but a number of his suggested dates need careful scrutiny. The period he gives for 2 Enoch (Slavonic Enoch) is probably some centuries out; on this point see W. F. Howard's *Drew Lectures, The Romance of New Testament Scholarship*.<sup>5</sup> A later dating than he suggested for the Similitudes has been put forward by a number of scholars.<sup>6</sup> The cautionary words of C. H. Dodd should be remembered:

It is usual to assume that the Enochic doctrine of the Son of man (Enoch 37-71) is presupposed in the teaching of Jesus. But (1) the last word has perhaps not been said about the integrity of the Similitudes of Enoch or upon the date of the 'Son of man' passages. . . .<sup>7</sup>

After fifty years of inaccurate teaching it is rash to expect that the tide can be easily turned. A number of the statements discussed in this article and shown to be unsupported by evidence, are now being learned by hundreds of students from scores of text-books! Yet we may draw some hope from a familiar saying in an apocryphal (not apocalyptic) book, 1 Esdras:

Great is truth and strong above all things.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

<sup>4</sup> See for example T. W. Manson's *Teaching of Jesus*, and more recently his article 'The Son of man in Daniel, Enoch, and the Gospels' in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. XXXII, No. 2 (March 1950).

<sup>5</sup> Pages 108-9.

<sup>6</sup> G. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, pp. 242-3; Bousset, *Jesus*, p. 85; N. Schmidt in *Encyclopaedia Americana* (article 'Enoch'); V. H. Stanton, in *Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible*, III.356.

<sup>7</sup> *Parables of the Kingdom*, pp. 92-3.

## THE WORLD FAMILY IN HISTORY

**A**LMIGHTY Father, of whom the whole family in heaven and on earth is named, we pray Thee to guide the nations of the world to live as members of one family. Inspire the peoples, who have found in conflict the strength which comes from unity, to preserve that unity in peace, and so to order the world in righteousness that all mankind may know the joy of fellowship in service of the Kingdom.<sup>1</sup>

This prayer is a perfect illustration of the main argument of this article. The prayer is new; there is nothing like it in the historic liturgies of the Church. Hitherto the Church has not so interpreted the message of the New Testament. And while the liturgies of the Church have excluded the world family, the theologies of the Church have forbidden it. We have said 'Our Father' in the one prayer in which we could not escape it; but the correlative 'Our Family' we have neither said nor sought.

This omission may seem amazing. It would seem even more so if it were not paralleled by similar omissions. Consider only two; it is certain that when St Paul declared that in Christ 'there is neither bond nor free' the ultimate abolition of slavery was assured; but how recently, and how reluctantly, even in the British Empire and the U.S.A.! Again, the emancipation of woman was bound to come, since in Christ 'there is neither male nor female'. Yet even today it is not complete.

The story of the neglect of the Family is both fascinating and tragic. Its main features are so stark that it may be told in clear and convincing outline. Even the Fatherhood was overshadowed for about fifteen hundred years.

First, and quite briefly, the New Testament data. We find there: (1) The Fatherhood of God is the central revelation in Christ. (2) It is the main theme of St John's Gospel and his Epistles. (3) It is the foundation of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (4) Every epistle of St Paul, whatever its content, opens with the message of 'grace and peace from God our Father' or 'the Father'.

A few facts will give a true perspective. Jesus uses the words 'My Father' 54 times, and speaks of or to 'the Father' 68 times; 'your Father' 12 times. The Acts and the Epistles speak of 'our Father' 17 times and 'the Father' 60 times. No other name for God is so used in the New Testament. We are taught to pray: 'Our Father . . . Thy kingdom come.' The Father's kingdom is a Family.

The period immediately following was one of sustained evangelism, and a fostering care of the newly founded Churches. The time and occasion for systematic thought and definition had not yet arrived.

Toward the close of the second century, with increasing contacts of non-Christian philosophies and the peril of false teaching, began that process of thought on the Christian revelation and experience that has never ceased. There are clearly marked periods in the history of Christian doctrine. They are: the Greek Period; the Roman Period; the Medieval Period; the Reformation Period; the Post-Reformation Period.

To each period belongs its distinctive achievement and also its distinctive limitation. As with persons so with peoples, their strength may also be their

<sup>1</sup> Issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the two Moderators for the Sunday preceding United Nations Day, 14th June 1944.

weakness; the secret of achievement in one direction the cause of their limitation in another. To see the limitation, in each case, is scarcely less important than to embrace the achievement.

#### THE GREEK PERIOD

The Greeks possessed a genius for metaphysical thought; seldom, if ever have they been equalled; never surpassed. This gift was shared by the Greek Fathers of the Church. As the Greek philosophers had sought to interpret Reality, so these Christian thinkers sought to interpret the Deity, as manifested in the Christian revelation. The influence of Plato soon made itself felt. His system of Ideas through which he sought to interpret the Supreme Good found in the Christian revelation a vital unity in a personal God, and an expression in the divine Logos. The Fatherhood of God remained supreme throughout the Greek period, with a Platonic background of philosophy.

While the Fatherhood was virtually unchallenged, the Person of Christ became the centre of discussion. Great and saintly men, notably Irenaeus, Clement, and Origen, contributed to that doctrine of the Divine Son which culminated in Athanasius. The famous battle of the iota was not futile; it was vital. It stood for the oneness in spirit and nature of the Son with the Father. Athanasius was pre-eminently fitted for his task. Saint as well as thinker he wielded an influence beyond his diocese with which rulers had to reckon. All succeeding generations are his debtors.

But there were limitations, inevitable to Greek thought and the very nature of the controversy. Athanasius was a Greek of Greeks. It was his genius for metaphysical thinking that led him to concentrate on the relationships *within* the Deity to the exclusion of their relevance to mankind. As Dr Scott Lidgett puts it: 'The very stress rightly laid on our Lord's unique Sonship threw into the shade the full meaning of the sonship of men as based upon their creation in Him.'<sup>2</sup> Athanasius also placed Creatorship before Fatherhood instead of Fatherhood as the *source and cause of creation* and the goal of revelation. Hence, men are creatures before they are sons, instead of *sons through their creation* 'in a Son'.

To this limitation all the Creeds bear witness. In all of them we have the Father in relation to the '*only Son*'; in none of them is the Fatherhood related to mankind. There is nothing answering to the 'Our Father' of the Lord's Prayer or to the seventeen 'Our Father's' of the New Testament. The same must be said of the *Te Deum*—the creed set to music. 'The Father Everlasting' is not the Father of mankind but of 'the Everlasting Son'.<sup>3</sup>

The Greeks gave us the Creeds<sup>4</sup>—that was their great achievement. In the process they overlooked the family—that was their limitation. This was the first great loss from the New Testament revelation. As a corollary, and a fact of profound importance, the Creeds contain no doctrine of man. That is our deepest need today.

<sup>2</sup> *The Fatherhood of God*, p. 178.

<sup>3</sup> *The Te Deum*.

<sup>4</sup> The so-called 'Athanasian Creed' must be excluded, as belonging to a much later period. Of uncertain origin, it has most unfairly been inflicted on Athanasius.



## THE ROMAN PERIOD

A still greater loss was to follow. Professor Whitehead has described it: 'When the Western world accepted Christianity, Cæsar conquered, and the received text of Western theology was edited by his lawyers. . . . The brief Galilean vision of humility flickered through the ages uncertainly. . . . The Church gave unto God the attributes that belonged exclusively to Cæsar.'<sup>a</sup> Few will accuse Professor Whitehead of unconsidered or unkind judgement. The Roman conception of sovereignty prevailed; God ceased to be a Father and became a Sovereign.

The Roman genius had two main attributes: Rule and Law. 'Most of the great leaders in the early Roman Church had been Roman lawyers and administrators.'<sup>b</sup> Augustine, the greatest figure of this period and far beyond it, was himself trained as an advocate; a Roman of Romans—as Athanasius was a Greek of Greeks. Already the concept of one Church, with a united episcopate centred in Rome, had taken shape. While Augustine accepted this Roman heritage and upheld Cyprian's paramount authority in the West, it is to his philosophic mind, and above all to his intense and profound religious experience that we must attribute his abiding influence on future generations.

Augustine gave to the Latin Church a theological basis congenial to it. It fitted into the Roman view of life. God is Sovereign. His will is absolute. He rules by law; He redeems by grace. But both law and grace proceed from the will of God. God is Sovereign, not Father; He is Will, not Love.

Augustine had an affinity for St Paul, both in temperament and in spiritual conflict. With his Latin love of law, he was especially drawn to St Paul's forensic illustrations of God's dealings with men. This bias he passed on to both Luther and Calvin. The over-ruling, all-caring Fatherhood of both Jesus and St Paul is omitted by Augustine. Christians became *citizens* of a *State* instead of *children* of a *family*.

Augustine's thought dominated the Church for a thousand years, and in all that time neither the Fatherhood nor the Family of God were within sight or hearing.

The Romans gave to the Church, law, sovereignty, organization, expansion. That was their achievement. They lost the vision of God's Fatherhood. That was their limitation.

## THE MEDIEVAL PERIOD

Sovereignty remained supreme in theology. The Church continued to develop its authority. God ruled in heaven; the Church ruled on earth. This process was aided by circumstance. As political power in Rome diminished, the authority of the Church increased. The Bishop of Rome ruled in the West; the Papacy replaced the Empire. Power corrupted, while the Church extended.

The chief change during this period was the replacement of the Platonic idealism by the logic of Aristotle. God becomes the logical First Cause and Architect of an *external* creation. With the First Cause established, revelation is put into logical categories and definitions. *Natural* theology is possible to man from the evidences in nature; *Christian* theology is *not* possible to man; it is

<sup>a</sup> A. N. Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, p. 485.

<sup>b</sup> J. Scott Lidgett, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

supplied by the dogmas of the Church.<sup>7</sup> These dogmas constitute a closed system of theology to be defended against all that differs from them. With such a system, under the Sovereignty of God, represented by the head of the organized Church, the Fatherhood of God becomes impossible.

Saints and mystics there were within the system, without changing it. It is to be noted that St Bernard's devotion, as his great hymns witness, was to the *human* Jesus, not the filial cry to a heavenly Father. Such a cry was foreign to the thought of the age.

Perhaps the best illustration of this period comes from the very heart of it. Dante, by common consent, represented the learning and culture of his age. Philosopher, theologian, politician, his wide learning and rich emotion were fused by an almost unique poetic genius. In his greatest work, *Divina Commedia*, he surveys the universe and especially the relations and dealings of God with mankind. Yet, as Dr Scott Lidgett points out, in the whole of this great work, the Fatherhood of God is only once mentioned and that in a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer! That is not exceptional; it is representative.

#### THE REFORMATION PERIOD

Luther has been called 'the hero of Wittenberg'; Calvin 'the thinker of Geneva'. The descriptions are deserved.

Luther's longing for a Living God refused to be denied. Nothing within the Church system could meet his need. Its elaborate provisions to that end proved barriers rather than aids. A visit to Rome made matters worse. He was revolted by what he saw, especially by the sale of indulgences. He turned to the Scriptures, and here found what he sought. St Paul's doctrine of justification by faith became for him the very word of God, bringing spiritual freedom. This doctrine remained supreme for Luther. By it he was willing to judge other parts of Scripture. Apart from justifying faith, God remains for all an angry Judge. Of His grace God becomes, for those whom He chooses, a gracious Sovereign. We submit to His *will* rather than respond to His *love*. By 'adoption' we become sons, but the life of sonship is not developed as in St Paul. The universal Fatherhood of God is entirely absent, and would have been utterly inconsistent with Luther's teaching.

Justification by faith is, of all Christian doctrines, the most individualistic. Here lies its strength—and its weakness. The individual stands alone before God. In that stand lies the claim to spiritual freedom. By that claim Luther won for himself and his followers freedom from an authoritarian Church. Unfortunately, with that he was content.

'Luther had really no successor' has been truly said. Dr A. Kuyper says: 'Luther never worked out his fundamental thought.'<sup>8</sup> With spiritual freedom came new responsibilities for men and nations. Further freedoms had to be won if spiritual freedom were to justify itself; or, indeed, to be itself secure. For these new responsibilities Luther proved unequal; for these further freedoms—political and national—Luther cared not at all.

Just over twelve years ago some Lutheran pastors bravely nailed a protest against Hitler's omniscient Reich on Luther's door at Wittenberg. It was

<sup>7</sup> The real unbelief (c.f. the spiritual mind of the Saints of Medieval age).

<sup>8</sup> Calvinism, p. 261.

the proper gesture. And yet, might they not have laid it *at* his door with more historical propriety?<sup>9</sup>

Luther won spiritual freedom; that was his achievement. He taught political subjection; that was his limitation and his grave error.

Calvin was above all else a thinker. A Frenchman by birth, he had an acutely logical mind with great powers of metaphysical thought. Luther had broken with the Roman system. The field was now clear for Calvin, with his powers of mind to erect another system within which men could find refuge. To Calvin, except in Germany, passes the real leadership of the Reformation.

The foundations of Calvin's system were two: (1) The absolute Sovereignty of God, and (2) the total depravity of human nature. Neither is new. They derive from Augustine. What is new is the keen-edged and uncompromising logic with which they are unfolded in every direction—positive and negative—to their grim, remorseless goal. Augustine might have been inconsistent with himself in declaring the human heart to be 'restless till it finds rest in God'. Not so Calvin. His logic is ruthless. The Sovereignty of God rules him; his intellect rules his system. God is fatherly in His providence, but only the pious can see it; He is truly Father in His grace, but only the elect can know it. Calvin related the Fatherhood of God to human experience more clearly and more closely than any teacher since the second century; but it was an experience *for the elect alone*. A truly grim fate awaits the non-elect, and over all is the absolute Sovereignty of God. It is claimed for Calvinism that it makes strong men; it cannot be claimed that it offers the foundations for a World Family.

#### THE POST-REFORMATION PERIOD

We now cross over to England—the Act of Union was yet to come, and Scotland was already committed to Calvinism.

Here in our search we find a people with a distinctive approach to life: practical rather than speculative; morally intuitive rather than logical; political rather than theological: yet not on these accounts less religious; in fact more religious for being themselves, than imitators of other peoples; a people, because of these qualities, *in all things Experimental*.

England's history for the three centuries following the Reformation records: a Political Revolution; a Scientific Revolution; a Philosophical Revolution; a Religious Revolution; an Industrial Revolution.

These great events are related to each other, and to our theme. Each radiated a world influence.

Before further reference to these historic movements, it seems relevant to our subject to note a very remarkable English Litany of 1544<sup>10</sup>—five years before the first English Prayer Book. The Litany is prefaced by an 'Exhortation to Prayer'. The most remarkable feature of this Exhortation is its use of the words '*our heavenly Father no less than fifteen times*, 'their Heavenly Father' twice, and 'your Father' once. The word family is not used, but here, on the national level of English life, is a beginning of the recovery both of the Fatherhood and family of God.

<sup>9</sup> Dr J. S. Whale, *Manchester Guardian*, 18th February 1946.

<sup>10</sup> The Preface was published in *Spiritual Issues of the War* (Ministry of Information).

(1) *The Political Revolution.* The Reformation in England was long overdue, and when it came it was more national than religious. There had been anticipations. England had given individual scholars to the Schools of Christendom. Among them were two Franciscans of the fourteenth century, William of Occam and Roger Bacon, of whom Maurice says: 'Both grew up in a period of English history which was likely to bring forth some of the most characteristic qualities. For any countryman of ours *not to be a politician, is strange and out of nature.*'<sup>11</sup> At the same time, their contemporary, John Wyclif, was leading something like a moral revolution in England. He too was political; but his greatest gift to his country and service to his age was the translation of the Bible into the mother tongue. 'From Wyclif to our own day, we shall find a sense of the sacredness of ordinary human *relationships* underlying our theology, our ethics, our politics, and determining their shape.'<sup>12</sup>

Henry the Eighth found the break with Rome easy, so soon as it pleased him to make it, because the people were ripe for it. England had always been restive under Rome. How could it be otherwise? It was not from Rome alone, nor chiefly, that England had been first evangelized. 'Not Augustine, but Aidan is the true apostle of England. Augustine was the apostle of Kent, but St Aidan of England.'<sup>13</sup> The last of the kingdoms of the Heptarchy to be converted was Sussex, the near neighbour of Kent; but it was the missionaries of the north and not the men of Canterbury who brought about that conversion. At the request of Oswald, King of Northumbria (then extending from the Humber to the Firth of Forth), Aidan came to Lindisfarne from Iona, where Columba's mission 'was altogether independent of Rome. . . . Iona succeeded where Rome had failed.'<sup>14</sup> The truth of the matter is that England was *evangelized* from the north; she was *organized* from the south. Nor may we overlook the significance of the fact that the pioneer translators of the Scriptures (save King Alfred) all derive from the Northumbrian area.<sup>15</sup>

William of Normandy came to England under the Pope's banner; but having arrived he refused to do homage to Rome. He is king of *England* now.

In the thirteenth century came the first Parliament with its roots in the folk-moot and the national council of the Anglo-Saxons, moulded under Norman influences. *Parliament* repudiated the papal claim to tribute that King John had promised. Later it was Parliament (1529-36) that broke with Rome, 'declaring at the same time that neither the king nor the kingdom would vary from the Catholic faith of Christendom'.<sup>16</sup> So England, while welcoming the Reformation of Luther, and receiving the message of Calvin, retained her own Catholicism. This became even more clear under Elizabeth, Mary's tragic interlude having served only to make the Roman supremacy for ever impossible.

English nationhood, under Elizabeth, came to its flowering, though not yet to its fruitage. 'Calvinism and Catholicism were both real forces in the English mind and in English literature. If either had been absent, we could have had

<sup>11</sup> *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, I.6.

<sup>12</sup> Maurice, *ibid.*, I. 31.

<sup>13</sup> Lightfoot, *Leaders of the Northern Church*.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> Tyndale, though born in Gloucestershire was, as his name indicates, of a Tynedale family that fled southward during the Wars of the Roses.

<sup>16</sup> *Ency. Brit.*, Article 'England'.

no *Faerie Queene* or *Othello*. The alkali and the acid produced a healthy effervescence.<sup>17</sup> Puritanism did not destroy 'Merrie England', it disciplined it. The Queen may not have realized how much she combined the two in herself, while holding the fanatics of either in check. 'She *did* know she was an English Queen. . . . She became the defender of the great national principle which each of them ignored.'<sup>18</sup> Nationhood, like personality, cannot be for ever kept in tutelage to a totalitarian organization, though it call itself the Catholic Church. Both persons and nations need to be redeemed, not dominated, by a *living* Church.

The nationhood and constitutional liberty of England had still to be tested. The Stuart kings were the instrument of that testing. With their theocratic notions, and the conception of divine right vested in themselves, they were real opponents of Parliament and people; but they had to go, and with their final going in 1688 the Parliament and nationhood of England were established. What is called the English Revolution might, with more truth, be called the Scottish interlude.

This period must not be passed without mention of four truly representative men: Hampden, Pym, Cromwell, Milton. The vital facts about them are: all were politicians; *all were laymen*; all were Christians; but not all were Puritan. In some respects Pym, the typical English Churchman, was the most formidable of them all; certainly the greatest parliamentarian. Taken together, in their variety and their unity, with their deep religious convictions, their flaming love of liberty, focused in a unity of aim and action, they embodied the political soul of England.

The 'Mother of Parliaments' was the creation of a nation greatly served by her sons. Other such sons going overseas made her a Mother of *Nations*.

England's nationhood found its first expression in political liberty. That was her gift and her achievement. Her limitation has been to be content with political liberty, and to leave her children too long exposed to the blasts of social neglect and economic injustice.

TOM DRING

(*To be continued*)

<sup>17</sup> Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosopher*, II.139.

<sup>18</sup> *ibid.*



## THE VILLAGE WHERE DREAMS COME TRUE

IF THIS title seems too faery for a serious Review you may call it 'The Village where Miracles Happen.' Perhaps that sounds more aptly theological! We live at a time when, if some of the dreams of internationalists and common people are ever to come true, it would seem that a miracle *must* happen. Here is a story to renew faith and courage in ordinary folk who have always believed that nations could live together if they really got to know each other.

The Village bears the name of Pestalozzi, and nothing could be more appropriate. Heinrich Pestalozzi himself was an educationalist, a passionate humanitarian, a lover of children and a practical idealist. All those qualities are to be found in this Children's Village, situated in the north-east of Switzerland, which is one of the glorious by-products of the holocaust which swept the whole world between 1939 and 1945. It did not exist, even in anyone's mind or intention, before the War. And probably nowhere but in Switzerland could it ever have been seriously conceived, much less actually created.

To reach Pestalozzi you must leave the well-trodden tourist routes and make your way to St Gallen in the industrial part of the country. To understand the situation it will be well to pause in this old town and wander round, amongst the plate-glass windows of large shops, the busy markets, and the quiet squares with their overhanging inns whose walls are painted with fantastic murals. In your walking you will inevitably come to the magnificent baroque Abbey, which houses one of the most priceless collections of classical and ancient manuscripts in Europe. Standing in its ornate splendour you would not doubt that you were in a thoroughly Roman Catholic part of the land. Yet, little more than a few yards away, outside the cathedral, you will find yourself looking up at a towering statue of one of Zwingli's fellow Reformers, and Protestantism is thrust upon you. There is something of the same contrast in the landscape, with its evident industrialism between Zurich and St Gallen, and its lovely pastoral lands and orchards beyond the towns. You may have found a contrast as startling in your fellow-passengers in the train, one group speaking fluent French, others German, and possibly others Italian. That is why it is good to stop for a while in St Gallen and realize the way in which, through the centuries, Switzerland has become a land of differing racial and religious groups and cultures and widely varied ways of life. Yet to share (as I did a few days later) in the *Fête Nationale*, the National Day, is to see that the people possess a proud and splendid sense of national identity. The aspect of this nationalism which is so significant to the project dealt with in this article is this—that its strength consists in the combining of national, racial, religious, and cultural groups, in which each preserves its own character and shares it with the rest, instead of being 'ironed out' into a featureless and commonplace 'unity'. Between nations such a situation is known not as 'internationalism' but as 'supranationalism'. The question which nags at many minds today is whether such supranationalism is possible—even between small communities of different nationals living together. Will not national characteristics, habits, customs, and cultures make it impossible? Some indication of the answer to that doubting question is to be found in this lovely village of Pestalozzi.

Walter Robert Corti was the son of a scientist from the Italian-speaking part of Switzerland. He had intended to specialize in brain-research and had passed his medical examinations when he was struck down with tuberculosis. It was while he was in a sanatorium at Davos that the possibilities of the Children's Village were born, while he lay thinking, month after month, in isolation from the world.

'Since wars are born in the minds of men, it is in the minds of children that the foundations of peace must be laid.'

That axiom has been the foundation of all Corti's work and that of his colleagues. It was clear that when the War ended there would be many millions of children, broken in body, twisted in mind, without faith in God or man, having no home, state or hope, in Europe. (The United Nations later put the figure at something over ten millions.) Yet it was on these children, or some of them, that the future of Europe would depend. Would it be possible to create a settlement, a Village, where representative children could learn to live together and later go back to their own countries with a new faith in supranationalism born, not in dreams, but in experience? Corti believed that the thing could be done. He spoke of it to his nurses and fellow patients, collected for it in a tin money-box and finally wrote a simple article for the magazine *Du* in which he urged that the Swiss people, in thankfulness for their preservation throughout two wars which had devastated the countries round them, should take the lead in the making of such a Village. The response to that article was immediate in his own country and before long it was stirring folk far beyond its frontiers.

The story has now been told for English readers in a delightful book<sup>1</sup> which includes thirty pages of photographs. It might well be on the bookshelves of every Christian in the country, for it would hearten us all.

One of the first dreams to come true in the making of the Village was Corti's discharge from the sanatorium, symptom-free, to lead in its creation. Offers of land came from all over the country and finally the gift from Trogen was accepted. The land was a little rolling plateau, 2,500 feet above sea level, near to the town of Trogen itself, overlooking Lake Constance. The villages of Germany could be seen across the Lake and the snow-capped mountains of Austria proved a horizon in the East. With the land came an old farmhouse and barn, with water and drainage laid on, and almost £2,000 in cash. A truly tremendous gift for a township of only 2,000 people!

The site was significant of success, for Trogen lies in the Appenzell *canton* which, like St Gallen itself which it surrounds, is half Catholic and half Protestant.

Now came the need for money—and it flowed in from all over the country. Children did work of every kind and sent their earnings. Nurses went without supper once a week and sent what they saved. Industrialists, townships, Rotary Clubs—all made large contributions. The children sold ladybird badges in the streets—the ladybird has become the 'badge' of the village—and raised enough to build the first four houses, which were then re-sold to a Swiss town or industry for £10,000 each, the houses then being 'donated' to the Village.

<sup>1</sup> *The Children's Village*, by Mary Buchanan (The Bannisdale Press, 6s.).

Next came the question of labour. The response was as ready and generous as had been the money. A famous Zurich architect, Hans Fischli, who had designed the 'Children's Paradise' in the Zurich Exhibition, designed the lay-out of the Village and the lovely houses themselves. In addition to the necessary craftsmen, voluntary labour was accepted wherever it was found—and an international brigade built the international Village. Since work was not begun until the Spring of 1946, when war was receding, German boys and girls worked alongside others from Holland, and British ex-soldiers shared with Italian students. Altogether six hundred volunteers from seventeen nations put in 25,000 hours of work. The largest contingent went from Britain.

The first children, from Southern France, were waiting in a nearby town before the roof was on their new home. They were followed, at the end of 1946 by the 'blond Poles' whom the Allies had found at Merano in Italy, and by other Polish children from Warsaw. In 1947 came Austrians, originally from Vienna; Hungarians (later, to the damage of the Village, recalled by their new Government), and Germans from Hamburg. In 1948 the greatest number arrived—two groups of Greeks, two groups of Italians, a group of Finnish children, and finally more French children, for the second house, from Alsace-Lorraine. In 1950, thirty British children were sent and now there are also Swiss children there, too. In all, there are about two hundred children of nine nationalities.

Selection was far from easy. In the beginning three main principles were laid down: (1) the children should be war-orphans; (2) they should have no disease or deformity; (3) they should be of average intelligence. These were necessary demands (though the first has been modified) when the purpose of the Village is understood. It was never conceived as a mere orphanage, an asylum for war-victims. It was to be a centre of international education, in the widest sense of that term, where children should learn to live together and eventually return to teach others what they had learned. They must therefore be those best fitted to profit from such an experience. Other conditions of entrance to the Village pointed in the same direction. The first wide age-range of 4 years to 14 years has been limited and children now going to the Village must be between the ages of 6 and 10 years. At least as important was the assurance that children would remain in the Village until they were 15 years old, and longer if their 'high-school' or 'craft' education made it necessary. But perhaps the fundamental principle is best seen in the assertion that those who come may never become citizens of Switzerland (except, of course, the Swiss children), may not be adopted by Swiss foster-parents, and will return to their own countries at the end of their stay in the Village. They are, and will remain, citizens of their own lands. This sense of national citizenship is maintained while they are in the Village by regular visits to their homeland, as far as possible, for several weeks or months in the summer. The strength of supranationalism lies in sharing and learning the best of the nation to which one belongs by inheritance.

Selection of the children on the Continent was made through official organizations, though a final verdict was given by a Swiss psychiatrist or the Village psychologist. In Britain, after two representative towns had been

decided upon—Hull and London—selections were made through education authorities, child welfare organizations, and representatives of the Churches and Salvation Army. In addition, a specialist in child diseases and psychology visited the home of each child. Such a 'filtering' process might seem almost too careful unless the purpose of the Village is kept in mind.

The selection of helpers has in some cases been almost as difficult and certainly as careful as that of the children. When the house-parents for the British houses were needed, for instance, more than a thousand applicants were considered.

What is life like in the Village, after the children have arrived?

The British children found life in full swing, after five years of Village life, and this is roughly what they saw and began to share.

Their own house had a delightful schoolroom, with books and maps in English, ready for use. There was a well-proportioned sitting-room, ideal for children. Upstairs there were bedrooms in which two, three, or four of the children would sleep together, each with their own shelves and furniture. Below the house was the store-room, equipped with spaces for shoes, boots, skis, food, and the like. The bathrooms, complete with showers, are charming. The house-parents had rooms of their own. And, of course, there was a kitchen. The one in the house was small, though large enough for making national dishes and for caring for any sick children, for all the main meals are prepared in the big central, electric kitchen. The Village, of course, is served by electricity, and each house has central heating.

Each house—all are typical Appenzell chalets—is occupied by nationals of one country only, and thus the national atmosphere is preserved. In this house they talk their own language, follow their own customs, eat their own home-dishes, sing their own familiar songs. They have a house-mother and -father, who are normally qualified teachers, who belong to their own race, and possibly another helper. They go to school in their own house, until they are ready for a grammar-school education in Trogen. The names of the houses—'Stepping-stones', 'Pinocchio', 'Madame Curie', 'Les Cygales', 'Kindersymphonie'—give an outward hint of the nationality of the children within.

Breakfast is early, for the children rise at 6.30, and the morning is usually spent at school in their own home or in the town. After dinner the Village becomes truly international. There are chores to be done together—cleaning the paths, peeling the potatoes (no more popular here than anywhere else). There are common 'cultural activities'—crafts, music, dancing, play-making, and so on—in the old farmhouse, the barn of which now contains a stage where international plays and ballets, usually home-made, are produced. Excursions, through the summer countryside and into the Swiss towns, or over the snows in winter, are international affairs. And, of course, after school is over there are constant visits from one house to another, while all the children have Swiss friends in Trogen itself.

Religion has its true place in the Village life. At present all who are there are either Catholics or Protestants, though provision would be made for the religious needs of others should they arrive. Priests and Protestant ministers have open access to the homes, though none live in the Village itself, and the Church of England minister from Zurich visits the English children, while Free

Church children during the first year, at any rate, had a service of their own conducted by the house-mother, who was a Methodist local preacher.

This is not an idealized picture, as visitors to the Village would realize. It cannot be pretended, however, that the beginnings of 'living together' were so easy. There was bitter hostility between Poles and Germans, for instance, Italian children refused to mix with French. There was the sense of insecurity, too, that came from a war background. Pictures were of tanks, guns, dead soldiers, and bombed houses. One child refused to unpack his parcel of meagre belongings explaining that he 'would be moved on in the morning'. Even when the British children arrived there were suspicions from some of the others. Is there nothing of 'miracle' in the contented sharing of life by nine so different nationalities, after only a few years of experiment?

Pestalozzi remains the only truly 'international' village in Europe. It is not of course the only 'children's village', but those in Scandinavia, in Italy, outside Paris, or on the slopes of the Pyrénées, care only for children of their own countries. This is readily understood, for only against the background of Swiss experience, probably, could such a community have come to life. Pestalozzi, however, is serving two other important purposes besides training national citizens with an international outlook.

In the first place it has become the headquarters of the *Fédération Internationale des Communautés d'Enfants*, the organization, supported by UNESCO, which exists to co-ordinate the work of the many children's villages throughout Europe. Those who wish to learn more of this work will be advised to read Elizabeth Rotten's pamphlet, published by UNA, *Children's Communities* (1s.). The author, a leading Swiss Quaker, was Corti's invaluable helper in the making of Pestalozzi.

Secondly, one of the intentions of Walter Corti was that Pestalozzi should be only the first of other such communities. Britain has always prided itself on its welcome to the stranger and on its humanity, and there exists already a British Pestalozzi Association<sup>a</sup> of which Mrs Mary Buchanan, the author of *The Children's Village*, is the secretary. Mrs Buchanan is a sociologist, with a special knowledge of child welfare and psychology, who did great service as the General Secretary of the London Refugee Council. One of the responsibilities of the Association in Britain is to maintain the British children already in the Swiss village. A second, of more far-reaching importance, is the establishment, in time, of an International Children's Village in this country.

It may well be that Switzerland, which, challenged by the horrors of war in the nineteenth century, gave the Red Cross to the world for the healing of broken bodies, will be found in this century to have given something far greater for the healing of the nations. This, at least, is clear—it is in the minds of children and in the practice of some such supranationalism as is now found in the Village of Pestalozzi, well founded on sound education, with an assured place for religious conviction and worship, that the way of an assured peace may well come. The lesson of Pestalozzi is that, in some little degree, it is achieved already.

CYRIL J. DAVEY

<sup>a</sup> Headquarters at 1 Park Crescent, Portland Place, London, W.1, from which fuller details about Pestalozzi Village may be obtained.



## FIRST AND LAST WORDS

### A Study of some Wesley Metres

THIS ARTICLE owes its origin to Dr Beckerlegge's interesting classification of the metres used by Charles Wesley, which appeared in this *Review* in July 1944. What a master of metre Wesley was! I want to make special reference to a group of metres, used by him with telling effect, which may conveniently be called the 'trochaic sevens'. The group includes both the 'straight sevens'—with verses of four, six, or eight lines respectively—and also two metres which Dr Beckerlegge classifies as 'mixed metres'. Their designations are 7676.7776 (with its variants 7676.7876) and 66.7777. In the old books these were styled respectively '7's & 6's' and '6's & 7's.' Students of Charles Wesley's hymns will know how much he used these metres.<sup>1</sup>

The special feature of the trochaic seven line is the emphatic position given to the *first and last syllables* of the line. This feature can be illustrated *passim* from the *Hymn-book*. Here are a few lines culled at random:

*Thee* the great Jehovah *deigns* (68)  
*Christ*, whose glory fills the *skies* (924)  
*All* my help from *Thee* I *bring* (110)  
*More* than all in *Thee* I *find* (110)  
*All* our blessings are *divine!* (77 in 1904 edition)

It is a mere matter of arithmetic that in trochaic lines of any length, having an *odd* number of syllables, the accent must fall on the last syllable of the line, as it does on the first. The smallest possible line of this type would be a three-syllable line, consisting of a first and last accented syllable, linked by a middle unaccented one. For instance, the line 'God is thine: disdain to fear' might quite legitimately be broken into two short lines of the 3.4 type, thus:

God is thine;  
Disdain to fear!

That would be a trochee three complemented by an iambic four. In the three-syllable line, there are two emphatic words linked together by what comes between them. What is true of this unitary line is also true, I feel sure, of the fuller seven line. In the same hymn (68) there is a seven line which illustrates this perfectly:

God, the almighty God, is thine!

All that goes between links up 'God' and 'thine'. It means: 'God is thine: almighty as he is!'

To digress for one moment, though it is no digression: these so-called 'mixed metres', in which there are couplets of trochaic and iambic lines *in that order*, may rightly be described as through and through trochaics, since the dependent iambic line is a follow-on of the trochaic line. We have seen how a trochaic

<sup>1</sup> Our survey is of trochaic metres, and it is perhaps needless to state that it excludes entirely two other metres in which a seven line predominates, namely '7's and 6's iambic,' and 7.7.4 4.7, which is also consistently iambic.

seven ('God is thine; disdain to fear') may be *broken down* into a 3.4 couplet, so also the familiar 7.6 couplet may be *built up* into a single trochaic line of 13 syllables. And the feature I have described as characteristic of the trochaic seven (namely the emphasis on first and last syllables) is often strikingly displayed in this trochaic thirteen, as in the lovely couplet:—

*Thou art wisdom, power and love,  
And all Thou art is mine!*

The short reading of this couplet is simply: 'Thou art mine.'

I propose to deal more fully with this trochaic 'thirteen' later, when we consider the 7's & 6's. Meanwhile it should be noted that the 7676.7776 metre might well be written 13 13 7-7 13, and the 7676.7876 as 13 13 15 13. This explains both of them quite a lot.

I would like to dwell a little more on this linking up of the first and last syllables of such a line as the trochaic seven. Trochees and iambs are closely connected. An iamb is, so to speak, a trochee reversed. Let the unstressed syllable be attached as a pendant to the stressed one, and you have a trochee. Let it precede and lead up to the stressed syllable, and you have an iamb. Metres are formally classified into trochaic and iambic according to the way the line happens to start. But it is at least equally important to note how the line *ends*.<sup>\*</sup> A trochaic seven and an iambic six are actually closely akin, since they end alike: indeed the iambic six might be regarded as a truncated trochaic seven. We have already noted that the trochaic seven and an iambic six together make up into a trochaic thirteen. A trochaic line will assimilate to its own character an iambic following.

It follows from this that a series of accented and unaccented syllables in the middle of a line will serve as a chain, with an iambic reference forward, leading up to the final accented syllable, and a trochaic reference backward to the first syllable. Both first and last syllables are *ex hypothesi* accented, and both thus serve as a stop to the flow. The first syllable is the engine that begins the train: the last the guard's van that completes it. The wagons between link beginning and end. An excellent example of the importance of the first syllable is afforded by No. 924: 'Christ, whose glory fills the sky.' That first word 'Christ' dominates the line, the verse, and the hymn. The remainder of the hymn is merely the predicate of the subject 'Christ'. And so it is with 'Christ, of all my hopes the ground'.

Quite remarkably often in Wesley's hymns there is actual repetition of the first word at the end of the line, with reinforced emphasis or poignancy. For instance:—

Come, ye thankful people, come (962)  
Tell, to after-nations, tell (699)  
Give Him then, and ever give (77 in 1904 edition)  
Where are Thy old mercies, where? (203)  
Why, ye ransomed sinners, why? (327)  
Hide me, O my Saviour, hide (110)

<sup>\*</sup> The reader is referred to 'Wesley's Hymns Reconsidered' in *The Hymns of Wesley and Watts* by the late Bernard L. Manning M.A. (The Epworth Press) for a study of the Wesley metres. Mr Manning fails however to stress the importance of the *last* syllable of the verse-lines. The way the line *ends* is at least as important as the way it begins.

In a great many other cases some link of association between first and last word is suggested and brought out. Consider that lovely couplet, in No. 465:

Silent am I now and still,  
Dare not in Thy presence move.

Yes, 'silent' and 'still', I 'dare not move'. I have already suggested that 'God is thine' underlies 'God, the almighty God, is thine'. But the theme is inexhaustible. 'None is like Jeshurun's God' is a treasure-house of such links between first and last words of lines and couplets (which are in effect long lines). More about that hymn later.

The dominance of the first word in the line sometimes, indeed often, gives Wesley's straight sevens an acrostic sort of effect. One of his hymns may serve as an example—a hymn which is either too cheerful or too full of mere creature comfort to be included in our present book. It is numbered, most appropriately, 77 in the 1904 book. Let me quote the second verse:

*He this flowery carpet spread,  
Made the earth on which we tread:  
God refreshes in the air,  
Covers with the clothes we wear,  
Feeds us with the food we eat,  
Cheers us by His light and heat,  
Makes His sun on us to shine:  
All our comforts are divine!*

Never was exclamation mark more appropriate! It is an acrostic of Divine providence, and the hammer blows of the inevitable MAIDSTONE suit it perfectly. Another example must suffice:

*Names, and sects, and parties fall:  
Thou, O Christ, art all in all! (720)*

Again an exclamation mark! Indeed the trochaic seven is the metre of exclamation.

But let me get on to the 'mixed metres' of our group. First comes the metre with the cumbrous designation, 7676.7776. This has always been familiarly known as '7's and 6's' (but *not* iambic). Even in Wesley's time, and indeed right down to the 1904 book, this name of '7's and 6's' also covered another metre, which the 1904 book distinguishes as 7676.7876. It would almost seem as if Charles Wesley did not distinguish these two, though he wrote hymns freely in both, and (what makes the confusion the more remarkable) used the two metres, consciously or unconsciously, for very different types of hymns. For brevity's sake, I propose, disregarding the first quatrain, which is the same for both, to designate the first '7776', and the second '7876'. Well, the 7776 type he generally uses for aggressive, defiant, or supremely confident hymns, and also for hymns of jubilant praise. To this generalization, Hymns Nos. 191 (God of unexampled grace) and 465 (Open, Lord my inward ear) are marked exceptions. The 7876 metre he uses very differently. He uses it for hymns of penitence, or of pathetic entreaty: it is almost a heart-broken metre.<sup>3</sup> In quite a number of these hymns

<sup>3</sup> But here again there is one marked exception: 'Good Thou art, and good Thou dost' (No. 59). Yet this hymn ends on a note of entreaty! <sup>4</sup>

(three in our present book out of a beggarly remnant of five), the last couplet serves as a pathetic refrain of personal entreaty:

Keep me, keep me, gracious Lord,  
And never let me go!

The difference in spirit between these two twin metres is remarkable. It is all induced by the insertion of a little unstressed syllable at the beginning of the sixth line. This has a twofold effect: (a) it destroys the 'trochaic-sevens' character of the *fifth* line, and (b) it links the sixth line on, as an iambic appendix to the fifth line, thus making of the two virtually a trochaic 'fifteen'. The whole verse indeed becomes virtually a trochaic quatrain, with an extended third line, which we might designate 13 13. 15 13. The long fifteen gives the peak of the verse, and there is a further effect hard to describe but unmistakable. The long rippling fifteen at last comes to an end, and with it there comes a marked *pa ue*, the third pause of the kind in the verse. This gives the point from which Wesley's haunting refrains begin. The best tunes to this metre illustrate this perfectly. See GERSAU (477).

This very brief reference to the 7876 variety will show up by contrast the character of its twin, 7776. The 'fifteener' of the 7876 type is replaced by two truculent trochaic sevens. As suggested above, it might well be represented as 13 13. 7-7 13. A quatrain of trochaic thirteens might be a possibility, but it would doubtless be a somewhat tame affair. The 13 13. 15 13 breaks the monotony one way: but this other metre does it in even more arresting fashion. The sixth line is a freak line, and intended as such. It puts in an *extra* hammer-blow where it was not expected. We expect one at the beginning and end of each couplet, but we did not expect this at the beginning of the sixth line, which should have followed on after the fifth in meek iambic fashion. It is this surprise hammer-stroke that gives the special character to this metre, coming as it does, on top of, or in addition to, the normal hammer-strokes of the verse.

This is worth examining in some detail, and I will take the famous JESHURUN hymn (68 in our present book) as an illustration. I must ask the reader to turn the hymn up for himself, as space forbids its full quotation. Let us see what a master-craftsman does with this metre!

Look first at the *normal* trochaic sevens, that is, lines 1, 3, 5 and 7 in each verse. Note the pattern they make in some of the verses. Look at the first words in each of these lines. 'Israel' comes in this position four times. 'God' comes in each of the four lines in verse 3, with gathering power and emphasis. In those two words, 'Israel' and 'God', you have the key of the hymn. Note how 'Thee' (referring of course to Israel) comes twice, in parallel positions, in verse 2. Note the balance of the two 'Alls' in verse 4. ('All' alternates with 'Israel' twice over.) Note the linked 'Blest' and 'Saved' of verse 5.

Now look at the *sixth* lines of each verse. They link up, by contrast or parallelism, with the fifth lines. In verse 1, 'Israel' is secure because 'God' is his. Verse 2 again insists that 'Israel' is 'Safe'. Verse 3 is even more striking. Here the parallelism between lines 5 and 6 is complete, save that, while line 5 supplies the *subject*, 'God', line 6 supplies the *predicate*: 'God' shall 'Fill thee

with triumphant joy'. A most interesting suggestion underlies the link between lines 5 and 6 in the fourth verse. Line 5 speaks of 'All his enemies'. 'All his enemies?' says line 6, 'yes, indeed, but you can put them all in one short word, *Sin!*' It is the fifth verse, however, which provides the classic example of what this 7776 metre can do with its sixth line. Note the parallelism once more:

*Jesus* is thy sevenfold shield,  
*Jesus* is thy flaming sword!

This word '*Jesus*' has only slipped in for the first time in the last line of the preceding verse, almost unnoticed, but in very lovely fashion. Till that moment the affair had been (in Old Testament language) between '*Israel*' and his '*God*'. Verse 4, announcing the rout of the enemy, and the consequent peace, puts it thus:

Israel now shall dwell alone,  
 With *Jesus* in his heart.

It is as if this blessed name of *Jesus*, almost casually introduced on the upward rebound of the iambic at the end of verse 4, kindles a new flame of exultation and assurance: so the fifth verse declares Israel to be 'blest' above all other peoples because he is, and will for ever be, saved 'by *Jesus*', yes, by *Jesus*—'thy shield, thy flaming sword'. The reference here is surely an oblique one to Genesis 3<sup>rd</sup>, to the 'flaming sword' that turned every way to keep sinful man out of his Eden: here the flaming sword turns every way to make forgiven man's Eden for ever secure. It only remains then to count the spoils:

Earth, and hell, and sin, shall yield  
 To God's almighty Word!

Note the capital letter for the last word, and the climax of the hymn: '*God's almighty Word.*'

The other type of 'mixed metre' in which the trochaic seven plays a vital part, 66.7777, is one which preachers and choirs alike seem to avoid. ECCLES is the only popular tune to this metre, and, with its repetitions, it is not characteristic of the metre at all. The verse is the combination of an iambic-six couplet, with a trochaic-seven quatrain. It is the fall of the stresses that gives it its peculiar character, together with the fact that the couplet takes precedence over the quatrain. (In 4.6's & 2.8's, and in the common 6.8's it is the other way round.) The couplet gives the text: the quatrain preaches the sermon. The couplet gives the theme: the quatrain develops and applies it. Each line ends on an accent, and the four lines of the quatrain also begin on one. This places a pause between each pair of lines except the first couplet. A verse of 440 may serve as example:

Who live, O God, in Thee,  
 Entirely Thine should be;  
 Thine we are, a heaven-born race,  
 Only to Thy glory move,  
 Thee with all our powers we praise,  
 Thee with all our being love.



Note the couplet with its text, and its smooth flow, followed by the sententious quatrain, with its emphatic first words for each line (Thine, Only, Thee), and the parallelism of the last two lines.

The couplet and quatrain are in contrast. To attempt to write a tune in this metre is to realize this change acutely: even the sloppy *EGGLES* recognizes it. Jamouneau's lovely tune, *KIRBY MOORSIDE*—whose omission is a great defect in our present book—changes both key (from minor to major) and metre (from triple to quadruple) at this point. I will close with another illustration of the haunting beauty and power of this exquisite metre, taken from the hymn (203) to which *KIRBY MOORSIDE* was once set:

Thy love is all my plea,  
Thy passion speaks for me:  
By Thy pangs and bloody sweat,  
By Thy depths of grief unknown,  
Save me, gasping at Thy feet,  
Save, O save Thy ransomed one.

Note the two parallel lines of the couplet, followed by two other parallels in each half of the quatrain. Note the emphasis on 'love' and 'passion'. It is this love and passion of the Lord to which the third and fourth lines so desperately appeal. Then there is the thrice-repeated 'Save' of the last two lines. But the whole hymn is full of examples of the importance of the first word in the trochaic seven line, and of how these several first words link together in a sort of chain. Note for instance in the first verse:

*Canst* Thou not accept my prayer?  
*Not* bestow the grace I claim?

Note also the threefold 'Speak' of the second verse.

I think Charles Wesley loved this metre. It was something more than a perverse desire to 'do something difficult' and to 'exercise his skill' (which was all that Mr Manning suggested) that inspired Charles Wesley's pen when he wrote in this metre.<sup>4</sup> It is a pity that its awkward pauses have frightened us away from its more frequent use. Appreciation of its very special qualities will make us use it more in our public worship. For the purpose of our present study its interest lies in the peculiar poignancy with which it can use the trochaic seven lines, made all the more effective by their contrast with the opening iambic couplet.

G. H. FINDLAY

<sup>4</sup> It is curious that it was John Wesley who introduced this metre almost casually by a translation that he made of a German hymn ('Thou Jesus art our King!' 737 in the 1876 edition). Hymn and tune (Irene) thus came in together; and suggested possibilities to Charles, who, though he knew no German, proceeded to make the metre his own, and wrote many hymns in it, as against his brother's one translation.

## PIONEERS OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA— OWEN WATKINS AND ISAAC SHIMMIN

**I**N 1890 the Pioneer Column sent up by Cecil Rhodes arrived in Mashonaland and hoisted the British Flag at Fort Salisbury. The following year two Methodist Missionaries reached the new settlement after a trek by ox-wagon of four months, during which they had journeyed seven hundred miles. They were the Rev. Owen Watkins, Chairman of the Transvaal District, and the Rev. Isaac Shimmin, a younger minister who was to take charge of the new work. By their exploits they became missionary heroes of the Church in their day, but with the passing of years they seem to have been forgotten; for some reason they never found biographers, and in the missionary calendar of our Sunday-schools their names are missing. 1951 being the Diamond Jubilee of our work in Southern Rhodesia, the time is opportune to recall attention to their achievements.

Shimmin left Kilnerton on 2nd June 1891 with the oxen and wagon, and was joined at Good Hope Mission by Watkins, who left Pretoria on 23rd June. They took with them Michael Bowen a native evangelist, John Peters a native driver, and John Walters a Cape Coloured man as 'voor-looper', i.e. leader of the oxen. Leaving the Mission on 26th June they set out on their long journey through almost unknown country. It was on 29th September that they entered Fort Salisbury and, although they cleaned their boots and Watkins put on 'a paper collar' for the occasion, they were travel weary, their oxen were depleted and in poor condition, but they had got through where many other parties that year failed. The account given in their journals and diaries makes fascinating reading and, besides telling a thrilling tale, it gives a vivid picture of the two chief characters.

In the story of the journey Watkins is the dominating figure; his age and experience, as well as his character, make him the natural leader. In one of his letters Shimmin speaks of himself as 'the junior partner', but they were partners and they had a very happy comradeship during those months. Later when left in charge of the new mission the qualities in Shimmin unfold, and we see in him a true pioneer who, in a few short years, accomplished much on which later workers were able to build. In what follows I have quoted much from their writings which are hidden away in old reports, preferring to let them tell much of their own story, believing that in this way we can see more clearly the stature of the two men to whom was given the joy and the hardship of breaking the way for Methodism into Central Africa.

### THE JOURNEY: WATKINS

We are travelling in an ordinary African tent-wagon, aptly described as 'the ship of the wilderness'. It is drawn by 16 oxen, and is 20ft long and 4ft 9ins wide, and in it is packed all we require for some months, except bread and meat.

Weather permitting we start each day at sunrise and travel for about three-and-a-half hours. Then we outspan until about 2 p.m., choosing a place, if we can find one, where there is grass and water. While the oxen are feeding we get our own breakfast, cooking it by the wayside. In the evening we outspan a little before sunset in the best

place we can find for the night. After dinner the three native men come into the wagon for family prayers. Very blessed seasons do we have in the wagon at the time of prayer.

On 2nd July they camped at Witte Klip where they found a man of the Matabele nation employed in the stable. He could speak the language of the Mashonas and our eager missionaries learned from him all they could.

This man calls himself 'By-and-by', a name which must have been given to him by a white man. He speaks Seshona, that is, the language of the Mashonas. We took our first lesson from him, . . . we repeated the word after him until we caught it; and then Mr Shimmin wrote the word in a book. We have already a vocabulary of more than fifty words, and we hope to increase it as we go along.

The arduous nature of their journey is made plain in the following, but even during the hardest days they found much of interest in the country, and their minds were never weary.

We are now entering a hot country. At 2 p.m. the temperature was 104° Fah. in the sun; and at 9 p.m. it was 62°, a drop of 42° in seven hours.

Only those who have camped out on the veldt at night know how such a drop in temperature is felt, and on one such night Watkins used the tea-cosy for his feet without telling Shimmin.

We are now in the thirst-land, there being no water for thirty miles; and this means that our poor oxen will have none for two days. . . . The scene is one of desolation, owing to recent grass fires; while the trees which fill the land look like ghostly skeletons mourning departed beauty.

Today I saw nailed high up on a tree, with a rag of white calico hanging below to attract attention, a rough piece of board and in rude letters done in ink, these words: 'Water here, 9th May 1891.' Alas, the water pools have dried up since then, and our poor, thirsty oxen must pass on. None the less, I say, God bless the man whose kindly heart prompted him to put up this board by the way. This, too, is our mission in the land whither we journey. 'Tis ours to direct the weary, thirsty multitudes of interior Africa to the 'fountain of living waters', and to cry with heart and voice: 'Water here.'

11th July. Very difficult road today, track led over rocks, roots of trees and through deep gulleys. Oxen very weary. Outspanned in a huge basin of trees. No sign of water here, but the Boers with us knew of a little fountain not far off, deep in the forest, so we drank thereof, and our cattle.

13th July. I am sorry to report we lost another ox today. . . . If our friends in England could see the places we have passed through with the wagon, they would say that no wagon made of wood and iron could ever hold together.

The Transvaal had struggled for and achieved an uncertain independence in 1881; there was still bad feeling and the tension was rising following the rush to the new goldfields, and, even as our missionaries were travelling north, there was a threat of an invasion of Mashonaland by Boers from the Transvaal. It is good to note the friendly relations Watkins and Shimmin enjoyed with all the Boers they met on their way.

7th July. Today we have joined ourselves to a party of Boers. They come from near Good Hope, and are taking meal, etc., into Mashonaland. They have four wagons and know the road well to the Limpopo. At the big rivers we shall need thirty-two oxen to pull us through, as the rivers are wide and the beds of the rivers deep in sand; and these good Boers will help us on our way.

When they came to the Limpopo they needed help and received it in full measure. In a fine passage Watkins describes the scene and his feelings on crossing the river into the 'promised land'.

14th July. This is a great day in the history of Wesleyan Missions in Africa. We have crossed the Limpopo, and have taken possession of the regions beyond in the name of Christ and Methodism. . . . Methodism can never go back, debt or no debt, now that we have entered these new lands. . . . We had to cross at Rhodes Drift, where the river is 150 yards wide. Our good friends, the Bothas, said: 'We will take you across. We will first take over one of our own wagons to try it, and then if it is safe we will take your wagon next. . . .' They came back for us and, our wagon being heavy, they put in forty-four oxen. It was a grand sight to see this long string of oxen, and the drivers standing in the river on each side of the oxen, flourishing their long whips. The Mission wagon was like a modern Noah's Ark, as it pitched and rolled in the surges of the river. At one point of the drift the oxen had only their heads above the water; the current being strong, one ox got frightened and his legs were carried from under him, and he was just held by the yoke and neck strap. I thought it was all over with him, but at that moment one of the Boers applied his terrible whip, and the poor brute made a supreme effort and regained his footing, and so saved his life. After a mighty struggle we got safely across. The Lord has fulfilled His promise: 'When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee, and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee.' We are under great obligation to the Messrs Botha for their kindness.

In the descriptions of the Sundays they spent on the journey we see them resting their oxen and their men, faithful in prayer and worship, and eager to preach the Word of God whenever possible. The first Sunday they were alone, so they had prayer and singing with their men, and the evangelist spoke a few words to some natives who came out of the forest.

12th July. As our wont is, we rested on the Lord's Day. We had a little service with the Boers who travel with us. . . . They understood a little English, and we understood a little Dutch, and so we had a mixed service. The Boers sang the first three verses of the 42nd Psalm. Their voices were deep and strong, and as they sang in a slow, solemn measure, 'My tears have been my meat day and night, while they continually say unto me, Where is thy God?', the sound rolled grandly through the forest. I could almost imagine myself taking part in one of the services of the Covenanters described by Sir Walter Scott. Mr Shimmin read in Dutch the 14th chapter of John, and we sang in English: 'Come to the Saviour, make no delay'. Then Michael, the native evangelist, offered a most moving prayer in Dutch. It was a touching thing to hear this native man pleading for blessings upon the Boers, from the President down to the poorest burgher. I doubt if these Boers ever heard a native man pray before. . . . I take it as prophetic of the time when Boers, Blacks, and British shall

*shout in universal song,  
the crowned Lord of all.*

Two weeks later, on Saturday 25th July, they arrived at the Telegraph Survey and Construction Camp on the Umzingwane river. Here they found about a

dozen white men and over four hundred natives, most of whom were Khama's people from Bamangwato. Some of them remembered Watkins who had visited their country and preached at Shoshong. The following day was a busy one.

At 9 a.m. about 200 of Khama's people came together. Most of them had their own Bibles and hymnbooks. They sat in a semi-circle by our wagon, and their own elders conducted the service, in their own form, at my request. They sang very sweetly, both time and tune being very good. The prayer was quiet but very earnest. I preached to them from 'God so loved the world, etc.'. The whole scene helped to inspire one. Here in the heart of Africa, we unite with Africa's sons in the worship of God, and declare the divine love to all people.

At 3 p.m. we held another service, and about the same number of persons were present. Mr Shimmin gave an earnest address on Prayer, and Michael preached from 'The Prodigal Son'.

At 7 p.m. we held a service for the white men. All the Telegraph staff were present, and a number of travellers and transport riders from some wagons outspanned near. I preached from 'Comfort ye, comfort ye saith your God'. It was a time of power from on high, and I trust some hearts were turned humbly to God.

There is a delightful entry in the journal for Friday, 17th July, giving a very human picture of Watkins, and enabling us to rejoice with him.

Crossed the great Shasha river, with the assistance of our friends the Bothas; we had thirty-four oxen to pull us through. Outspanned in a grove of palm trees, and are surrounded by strange forms of beauty. As I am forty-nine years old today, Mr Shimmin took my photo under the palms, and my heart is singing:

*Lord, in the strength of grace,  
With a glad heart and free,  
Myself, my residue of days,  
I consecrate to Thee.*

Leaving the River Lunde on 14th August, they entered Providential Pass five days later, and on 20th August came to outspan at Fort Victoria. They had now travelled six hundred miles from Pretoria, their oxen were failing, and they decided to rest for twelve days before setting out on the last stage of two hundred miles to Salisbury. They needed the rest for they had lost two of their oxen and no more were to be had for love nor money, the remaining oxen were not good, and the two hundred miles to Salisbury were reputed to be the worst in the whole journey because of heavy sand and poor grazing. After leaving the River Lunde they had seen over fifty graves, a grim reminder of what the pioneers had gone through during the first year of the occupation. Most of the deaths had taken place during the rainy season after the occupation. During their stay at Fort Victoria they visited the ruins at Zimbabwe and speculated on their origin; they had some talk with two ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church who had visited Mashonaland, and gained valuable information about the country whither they were going. A day or two after resuming their journey, they spent a Sunday with Mr Thomas, the son of a former L.M.F. missionary in Matabeleland. After the defeat of Lo Bengula Mr Thomas became Native Commissioner in Matabeleland and proved a great friend to our Mission at Tegwani.



On 29th September they reached Fort Salisbury and soon began negotiations with the officers of the Chartered Company. Watkins was not satisfied with what they offered and remained in Salisbury until Rhodes came, when he obtained an interview and by his persuasiveness and persistence gained what he required in the way of land for churches in Salisbury and Umtali, and the promise of three farms for mission stations in different parts of the country. This interview, which took place early one morning as soon as Rhodes was out of bed, is well described in *Limpopo to Zambesi* by the Rev. C. Thorpe.

The day after the interview with Rhodes they set off to trek one hundred and sixty miles to Umtali, and from there Watkins intended to walk two hundred miles to Beira so as to catch a steamer for Durban, and then to travel overland to Pretoria where, as Chairman of the District, he had a Synod to attend. They made Umtali on the morning of the eighth day; Watkins immediately engaged carriers for his packs, and then went to the Resident Commissioner to see about the plots of land for the Church promised by Rhodes. The next morning he left on foot for Beira and Shimmin was left alone to carry on the work so begun.

Watkins caught fever on his journey to Beira and on reaching Pretoria he became so ill that his life was despaired of for days, and he was later forced to return to England. By 30th April 1892 he had recovered sufficiently to attend one of the Annual Meetings in London, and was asked to second a vote of thanks. His rising to speak was the signal for much applause. He spoke feebly but with great clearness.

It seems to me very appropriate today that Africa should move the vote of thanks to the Chairman of this meeting where Africa has been forgotten. Doubtless India is very important. Doubtless China is of increasing importance, but as Methodist people, I beseech you, remember the open doors and the widening possibilities we have in the interior of Africa.

Truly Owen Watkins was a great African missionary and a bonny fighter, and it is good to note that at the Annual Meetings the following year when he was one of the speakers, the Chairman, Mr Ferens of Hull, referred to him in these words:

Mr Owen Watkins had shown them what was being done in Africa, until they were nearly as familiar with that country as they were with Yorkshire.

There is no better way of leaving Owen Watkins than with words he spoke at that meeting:

Our eyes are looking already to the land that is beyond the Zambesi, where there are hundreds of miles that the foot of the white man has never trodden, where there are millions of people who have never yet heard the sound of Jesu's name. We are going over the river whether you send us or not. We are going because Christ died to redeem them.

Fortunate was Shimmin to have been the comrade of such a man on that long trek north; happy, too, to have been chosen to carry on the work so begun.

HARRY BUCKLEY

(To be continued)

---

## Notes and Discussions

---

### SOME RECENT CONTINENTAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO NEW TESTAMENT STUDY

ONCE again we begin by calling attention to an article in *Theologische Zeitschrift*, the Swiss periodical so ably edited by Professor Karl Ludwig Schmidt. It is written in German by a Norwegian scholar, N. A. Dahl of Oslo, under the title *Adresse und Proömium des Epheserbriefes*. The writer goes carefully into the theories of authorship and comes down on the side of St Paul, regarding Ephesians as a circular letter taken by Tychicus to Laodicea, Hieropolis and other churches not founded by Paul but within his range of apostolic influence in proconsular Asia. The absence of the words 'in Ephesus' in the address according to the oldest and best authorities shows that when the *Corpus Paulinum* was formed the original destination was not known. Dahl suggests that while Tychicus was staying in Ephesus local interest in this letter may have led to his reading it to the church in that city, and copies may have been made in some of which the name of Ephesus was inserted. The most important part of this valuable essay is the careful analysis of the first fourteen verses, discussing the syntax and structure of the clauses with results bearing on the purpose of the writer and the exegesis of certain passages. Dahl refers to Mr W. F. Flemington's recognition of the baptism motif in Ephesians 1:13-14, a conclusion at which he had himself arrived independently.

In the years before the war a part of this annual survey was a notice of any New Testament articles which appeared in *Theologische Rundschau*. That supply was cut off during the war, and afterwards belated issues to the end of 1942 came in. It is only within the last few weeks that we have had access to this indispensable periodical. It appears that under Government pressure it was combined with another periodical of a different character and was only resumed for the volume 1948-9. In this, the third and fourth instalments of W. G. Kümmels' survey of books about Primitive Christianity take up the subject at the point left off in the volume for 1942. The other articles in this volume bearing on the New Testament are 'American Literature on the New Testament since 1938' by Dr Kendrick Grobel of Nashville, and an essay by the eminent Old Testament scholar, Paul Kahle, dealing with the question of the kind of Aramaic spoken in Palestine in the time of Jesus. Next year we hope to supply a report of all New Testament articles which have since appeared in *Th. R.*

A few years ago attention was drawn in this survey to a book by Professor Bo Reicke of Uppsala, written in English and published at Copenhagen, entitled *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism*, a study of I Peter 3:11. This distinguished scholar has just published another big book, this time written in German, and published both at Uppsala and at Wiesbaden: *Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos*. It is a study of the early Christian *Agape*, its connexion with the Eucharist, with the ministry of almsgiving, its corruption through revelry, and its place in the history of Christian liturgy. With an immense amount of

learning, it deals exhaustively with the New Testament evidence, explores Jewish ritual and practice, and examines Gnostic writings. The bibliography is indeed comprehensive. The student who works carefully through this massive work will find a good deal of light shed on some of the less well-worn paths in early Christianity.

From Sweden we turn to Greece. Last year saw a gathering of scholars from many lands to celebrate in Athens the 1900th Anniversary of the coming of St Paul to Greece. Some of these, and many others who could not accept an invitation to be present at the celebrations, have contributed to a volume of essays, *Paulus-Hellas-Oikumene* (An Ecumenical Symposium) edited by Professor Bratsiotis, of the University of Athens, and published by the Student Christian Association of Greece. The essays are in English, French, and German. Many countries are represented, and many Churches. Among the Methodists are Dr John Foster of Glasgow and Mr D. T. Niles of Ceylon. The contributions are over thirty in number and touch on a wide variety of Pauline subjects. When we say that Emil Brunner writes on The Apostle Paul, Henri Clavier on The Personality of Paul, W. H. P. Hatch on St Paul's View of the Future Life, Basil Ioannides on the Foundations of Pauline Ethics, Irinaios, the Metropolitan of Samos, on The Apostle Paul and the Eastern orthodox Church, Angelos Nissiotis on Paul as Interpreter of the Old Testament, and Regin Prenter on The Holy Spirit in St Paul, it is clear that there is plenty of interesting material for the reader.

Most of the books that have come our way belong to the field of Johannine literature. Two of these are written by Roman Catholics. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes übersetzt und erklärt von Alfred Wikenhauser*, is Vol. 4 of *Das Neue Testament* edited by this writer and Otto Kuss (Regensburg, Gregorius-Verlag). After about twenty-seven pages of introduction, a German translation is given, with a brief running commentary, interspersed with a number of short excursuses. The writer is acquainted with modern critical theories and presents them fairly, but the introduction ends with the decision of the Papal Biblical Commission of 1907, which declared: 'External and internal evidence show that the Apostle John wrote the Fourth Gospel. The acts of Jesus related in it are not mere allegories or symbols representing religious truths. The discourses are not free theological creations of the author placed in the mouth of Jesus.' The writer evidently inclines to the theory of textual displacements in this Gospel. That view receives favourable consideration from other Roman Catholic scholars. *Die Literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums*, by Eugen Ruckstuhl, appears in the series, *Studia Friburgensia*, published under the direction of the Dominican Professors in the University of Freiburg in Switzerland. This book is a careful examination of three books by three eminent scholars, Rudolf Bultmann, Eduard Schweizer, and Joachim Jeremias. Bultmann's drastic analysis of the Gospel's sources allows most of the Gospel to the Evangelist who drew his material from 'Revelation discourses', a 'Signs source', and various other traditions, some of good authority. The 'Revelation discourses' were translated from an Aramaic original, and were written in a rhythmic and often antithetical style. The 'Signs source' was written in a Greek style that resembled Semitic, but was not an actual translation from the Aramaic. Then Bultmann discovers a Redactor, who added in an ecclesiastical interest the section in

Chapter 6 which gives a eucharistic character to the discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum, and also Chapter 21. He introduced the figure of the Beloved Disciple to prepare for the story of the rehabilitation of Peter and the authorization of this other disciple as his equal and successor. The Redactor is responsible for many short insertions and for the disordered state of the text as it has come down to us. The greater part of Ruckstuhl's book is a detailed criticism of Bultmann's theory. He then goes on to a much more appreciative examination of Schweizer's Style-criticism, but exposes it to further criticism. It should be said that Schweizer's book *EGO EIMI* is a very valuable application of a linguistic method that can contribute much to our understanding of the sources used by the Evangelist. The last part is a critique of the arguments adduced by Joachim Jeremias in an essay published in *Theologische Blätter* in 1941. This is a book to be studied by anyone who is interested in the literary criticism of the Fourth Gospel. One cannot fail to learn much from it, as also from the investigations of those scholars whom Ruckstuhl attempts to controvert.

Bultmann has now brought out the second *Lieferung* of his *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. This is almost entirely devoted to the Johannine theology though the last few pages open Part III, *Die Entwicklung zur alten Kirche*, and the *Lieferung* breaks off in the middle of a word. This is far more satisfactory than the portion which dealt with the Gospels, and the most illuminating section is that devoted to the Johannine dualism. We wait now with impatience for the final instalment of this important book.

Everything written by Oscar Cullmann is sure of a welcome. His latest brochure comes in French and is published by Presses Universitaires de France, Paris (1951). *Les Sacrements dans L'Évangile Johannique* is a most fascinating *ballon d'essai*, for it is difficult to take it as more than this. Most students of this Gospel recognize a strongly sacramental strain in the third and sixth chapters, and there are a few other places where a possible case can be made out for such allusions. But Cullmann takes chapter after chapter and discovers sacramental hints and references everywhere. This contention is sure to lead to considerable controversy.

Another important book, *Consummatum Est*, comes from Sweden. Unfortunately it is written in Swedish, though an English translation is being prepared. Fortunately it contains an English summary, which gives an outline of the argument and makes us anxious to see the book itself in English. The chapter headings will indicate the general line that is followed. (1) The Problem and the Task; (2) The Church and Ministry in the Gospel of St John; (3) The Liturgy in the Fourth Gospel; (4) Eschatology and Church in the Fourth Gospel; (5) Important Theological Conceptions; (6) The Idea of Election in the Fourth Gospel; (7) *Consummatum Est*. Some idea of the writer's position may be gleaned from two or three sentences about the conception of eschatology. 'Eschatology becomes *superficial* when identified with apocalypse and used as a means of describing the events of the last day. Thus it has lost the possibility of giving people a true conception of the fundamental of faith, and has been relegated to the last paragraphs of dogmatics. The eschatology has been *spiritualized* when detached from the future and turned into a "realized eschatology". It has thereby changed into mysticism. An eschatology which is not pointing forward, no longer deserves its name. It has a dissolving effect on

both Church and theology'. The author is Dr Alf Correll, of whom we shall hear more.

In 1937 the second volume of the *Göttingen Bibelwerk* came out, *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, with Rengstorff's commentary on Luke and Büchsel's on John. It was with some surprise that an announcement was read that the exposition of St John in this series was by Hermann Strathmann. Büchsel was extremely conservative, and his death may have given the editors an opportunity of replacing that contribution by one closer to the general method of approaching this Gospel today. It is evidently an entirely different book, and though only a more careful reading than has yet been possible would justify an appraisal, the first impression is that it will repay steady examination.

The last book considers this Gospel from a different angle. *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium* is by Christian Maurer and is published by Zwingli-Verlag at Zürich. When Dr W. R. Inge examined this relationship in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, he considered possible reminiscences in Romans 7<sup>2</sup>; Philad. 7<sup>1</sup>; Magn. 7<sup>1</sup>, 8<sup>2</sup>; Ephesians 5<sup>2</sup> and Romans 7<sup>2</sup>; Ephesians 6<sup>1</sup>, 17<sup>1</sup>; Philad. 9<sup>1</sup>, and came to the conclusion that Ignatius's use of the Fourth Gospel is highly probable, but falls some way short of certainty. Maurer bases his conviction that Ignatius had read John on three passages, Philad. 7<sup>1</sup>, 9<sup>1</sup> and Romans 7<sup>2</sup>. The three points of closest contact he finds in what they write about Truth, Unity, and the Eucharist. They both lived in a milieu where Gnostic language was extensively used, but whereas John adopted Gnostic expressions to fill them with a biblical content, Ignatius used Johannine language in a Gnostic sense. This is a book of value to the New Testament student as well as to the student of Patristics.

W. F. HOWARD

---

## HOLY COMMUNION AND SACRIFICE

But Christ having come a high priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation, nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? (Hebrews 9<sup>11-14</sup>)

THE PURPOSE of this article is to discuss the relationship between Holy Communion and Sacrifice. On the one hand we have the belief of those who call themselves 'Catholic' that the body of Christ is presented on a thousand altars every day, and on the other hand we have the phrase that some of them use as well as we in the prayer of consecration, that Christ made on the Cross, 'By his one oblation of himself *once offered*, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.'

What is the truth about it all?



## I SACRIFICE AND RELIGION

The element of sacrifice goes back as far as religion itself and is world wide. Whatever the motive, which varies from place to place and from time to time, people have always brought gifts to their god. It may be food which it is thought that he eats; it may be an animal whose life is thought to have some mysterious efficacy in removing evil or the wrath of the god; it may even be the sacrifice of some human being, a man or a child, whose death is thought to be efficacious in propitiating the god or in warding off evil spirits. The Psalmist says, 'Bring an offering and come into His courts', and there is a deep feeling in the hearts of men that they should not appear before God empty handed, but that a costly gift should be brought, by a poor widow two mites which together make one farthing, which indeed was all that she had, but by those more wealthy a gift that will cost them something, not something that they will not miss.

There is no need to elaborate on the well-known Jewish sacrificial system, with its peace-offerings, whole burnt-offerings, and its failure to provide for atonement for 'sin with a high hand', deliberate and wilful sin.

## II THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST

Yet men feel the need for some means of getting rid of guilt. Men are cut off from God by sin; there is a barrier between the sinner and God which must be broken down. There is a need for atonement or reconciliation.

There is need for *man* to be reconciled to God, for when we have done people an injury we proceed to dislike them and avoid them, and the man who has deliberately sinned does not want to approach God or to pray to Him, or to have fellowship or communion with Him. He needs to be won back to God, and he is often won back by really seeing the Cross and what it means, by the compelling evidence there of the heinousness of sin, of the fact that sin always brings suffering upon the innocent, that the one sinless person who ever lived was crucified by the ordinary sins of ordinary men.

But there is also a feeling that *God* needs to be reconciled, that it would be reasonable for God to give up the whole human race in disgust and let it go to destruction in its own way, and every individual in it. There is a deep-seated feeling in the hearts of men that God needs to be persuaded as well as men, that we ought not to appear before God empty-handed, and that when we have done as we have done we should not appear before Him without an offering.

But what offering can we bring? What offering is sufficient? And the answer is again: The sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross for the sin of the world. The Why and How is for more learned theologians than the writer, but the Epistle to the Hebrews says that the essence of it was the offering of a perfectly obedient life, an offering which none of the rest of us has ever been able to bring.

Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith.

Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not,  
But a body didst thou prepare for me;  
In whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hadst no pleasure:  
Then said I, Lo, I am come . . .  
To do thy will, O God. (Hebrews 10<sup>5-7</sup>)

It is the sense of this need of some act on our behalf, as well as of repentance, that is expressed in so many of our hymns:—

*Not all the blood of beasts  
On Jewish altars slain  
Could give the guilty conscience peace  
Or wash away our stain.*

*But Christ, the heavenly Lamb,  
Takes all our sins away;  
A sacrifice of nobler name,  
And richer blood, than they.*

(M.H.B., No. 234)

And again:

*Just as I am, without one plea  
But that Thy blood was shed for me,  
And that Thou bidd'st me come to Thee,  
O Lamb of God, I come!*

(M.H.B., No. 353)

There we have it again, not only the gracious invitation, but the act of atonement which in some way has made the invitation possible.

### III HOLY COMMUNION

And that brings us to the Holy Communion. What is the connexion between that sacrifice offered once for all upon the Cross and the Holy Communion?

Roman Catholics and Anglo-Catholics would say that the bread and wine of the Communion become the veritable body and blood of Christ and that, though the oblation on the Cross was once for all, the *presentation* of the sacrifice is repeated. The sacrifice in Jewish days was in the open air, but the blood of the sacrifice was in certain cases taken within the holy place and there sprinkled on or round the altar. In like fashion, they would say, the sacrifice of the Cross is indeed once for all, but the blood of the sacrifice is presented daily upon the altars of the Church.

That is not our view. It would almost seem that that view was deliberately excluded in the liturgy of the Anglican Church by the very prayer of consecration itself, 'Who made there, by His one oblation of himself, *once offered*. . . ' It would surely be a very nice point to distinguish between 'offered' and 'presented'. We do not accept the doctrine of trans-substantiation, even when Anglo-Catholics, to avoid using the actual term, call it with Luther (whom otherwise they heartily dislike) 'Con-substantiation'.

We say three things about it:

(1) First, the bread and wine of the Holy Communion represent to us Christian people, to the eye of faith, the body and blood of Christ. They have for us more significance than *mere* bread and wine. They *represent* to us the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. A photograph of my mother means more to me than it does to other people, and the bread and wine solemnly consecrated and set apart for a special purpose mean more to Christians than they do to outsiders.

The Holy Communion is a vivid and dramatic representation and reminder of the sacrifice of the Cross. As we break the bread we are forcibly reminded of His body broken for our stead on the Tree. As we pour out the red wine we are forcibly reminded of His blood poured out for us.

The sacrifice has been made once for all, but we are forcibly reminded of it, and of the need for it, as we celebrate the sacrament of Holy Communion.

(2) Secondly, we not only remind ourselves of it. Speaking boldly and as little children we remind God of it. We do not offer again the sacrifice, but we plead the sacrifice once offered. We are bold to say to God what our children sometimes say to us: 'You promised.' We don't need to be reminded of our promises to our children, and God does not need to be reminded; if we were very sophisticated we might not trouble to remind Him, or to tell Him of our needs in prayer, because he knows already, but then we should lose the child-like attitude which is the right attitude. 'Unless ye turn and become as little children ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.'

(3) Lastly, we do offer a sacrifice at the Holy Communion, and it is the sacrifice of the body of Christ. But that body is not to be found in the bread which is the symbol of His incarnate body. He has now a new body which is the Church.

It is the Church which comes together in the Sacrament of Holy Communion and is raised to the greatest possible level of present spiritual attainment by its confession of sin, the promise of pardon, and by being welded together in one body by the common meal in the presence of Christ who has promised that where two or three are gathered together in His name He will be in the midst of them.

And so, after being raised to the highest of which we are now capable, having heard the declaration of forgiveness in the Comfortable Words, and having been unified by the common meal, we say, through the mouth of the celebrant: 'Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee . . . and though we be unworthy to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service.' It is the offering of ourselves, a united body, the body of Christ, the Church, as a sacrifice to God, henceforth to be wholly obedient to Him, the sacrifice of obedience.

So this sacrament is a vivid and dramatic reminder to us of the sacrifice of Christ offered once for all on the Cross; we plead that sacrifice before God; and we make the sacrifice of ourselves, the Church, the body of Christ, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice to Him. We seek to be able to say with Christ our Lord: 'Lo, we are come to do Thy will, O God.'

V. D. SIDONS

NOTE. For the sake of completeness it is necessary to say that there are other spiritual sacrifices in the Holy Communion besides the sacrifice of obedience.

There is the sacrifice of thanksgiving (Psalm 50<sup>14</sup>) seen especially in the 'Therefore with angels and archangels' and in the 'Glory be to God on high', hence the title, the Eucharist.

There is also the sacrifice of the contrite or penitent heart (Psalm 51<sup>17</sup>) seen especially in the confession of sin, in the Prayer of Humble Access, and in such phrases as: 'And though we be unworthy to offer unto Thee any sacrifices.'

## 'THE DEAN' ONCE AGAIN<sup>1</sup>

WHEN Dean Inge, aged ninety-one, promised to give the latest Gore Memorial Lecture because there were 'things that he wanted to say' about St Paul, he did well. For it turns out that he is 'Pauline' as well as 'Johannine', holding that John is the best interpreter of Paul. In the eighteen pages of this Lecture there are many of the old marks. For instance, there is scintillation, but never mere scintillation. Or again, when the Dean comes upon such of his old foes as Predestination or Sacerdotalism or the doctrine of the Tortures of the Damned (whether in Romanism or Protestantism), he 'lets himself go' as of yore. On the other hand, he still sometimes follows his old way of presenting a hearer with a provocative *obiter dictum* and passing on—leaving the said hearer just opening his mouth to say: 'But . . .' I find that I have marked fifty-one places in the eighteen pages for notice, but, of course, a selection from them must serve.

While the Dean does not attempt to systematize Paul's teaching, he has something to say about all the Apostle's chief doctrines except that of the Church. He is glad that we know too much of Paul to 'idealize' him, for, 'if we wish to idealize a human being, the less we know of him the better'! Yet he writes: 'In St Paul I find what I need.' This does not mean, however, that he thinks Paul inerrant, for he rejects some of the Rabbinisms, and he thinks that in Romans there are passages that come too near Luther's extreme and mistaken doctrine of 'Justification by Faith'. He thinks that the Council of Trent did well to denounce the doctrine that 'man is justified only by the imputation of the justice (i.e. *justitia*, righteousness) of Christ'. Is he not right when he says that Luther's account of Original Sin is extravagant (and may we not add, Wesley's doctrine if his treatise on the subject be taken apart from his references elsewhere to Prevenient Grace)? Or again, he will not allow, as Barth claims, that God is 'wholly other', for this does not do justice to the New Testament doctrine of *pneuma*, which is 'superindividual' but not 'superpersonal'. This is a very pertinent distinction, for there is no 'personality' without fellowship, and how can there be fellowship between the wholly different? One is both glad and a little surprised when the Dean adds, on the other side: 'The "I and Thou" relation is never transcended.' While he allows—no doubt, thinking of such writers as Kierkegaard and Barth—that 'there is and must be an element of venture in faith', he defines 'faith' as a resolution to stand or fall by the noblest hypothesis, and the word 'hypothesis', of course, claims a place for reason.

There is a good deal about Paul's eschatology, with comments on eschatology in general. For the Dean 'all eschatology is symbolic' since 'there cannot be any direct revelation of life beyond the bourne of time and space'. This, he thinks, leaves the individual Christian a good deal of elbow-room on this subject. For himself he says, 'Philosophically I do not think that anything that really is can ever cease to be', and he suggests that when Paul speaks of 'destruction' (without 'drawing lurid pictures') he need not mean 'annihilation'. Yet, 'St Paul was not a universalist.' I am glad that the Lecturer accepts an anti-my here, but I wish he had told us how he would phrase it.

<sup>1</sup> *The Faith of St Paul*, by W. R. Inge (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.).

On the doctrine of the Person of Christ there is hardly more than a number of *disiecta membra*—to which, no doubt, the Dean would reply that this is so with Paul himself. He tells us rightly that we have no exact equivalents for a number of Greek terms, including *theos*, and that this is one of the words that the first Christians used 'in a new sense'. Yet he says too that 'any immortal being was *theos* to the Greeks and even to Greek Christians'. He suggests that Paul himself illustrates this when he speaks of 'the god of this age', but he also says that 'St Paul, as a Jew, avoids calling Christ God'. Would not a Jew, when he spoke of 'the god of this age', mean 'the being whom this age makes into its god'? Under Philippians 2<sup>6-11</sup>, after saying that '“robbery” is nonsense' as a rendering of *harpagmos*, which means 'something picked up without trouble, a windfall', he goes on: 'St Paul says that before the incarnation Christ Jesus was in the form of God, but not equal with God. Equality with God, and the title Kurios, . . . were bestowed upon him as a reward for his heroic self-sacrifice. That is not Nicene orthodoxy; it is gently corrected in the Fourth Gospel.' What would Bishop Gore have said of this?

To add one more illustration of the great interest of this Lecture—the Dean believes that 'nothing very unusual' happened on the Road to Damascus, for there are many parallels in the experiences of the mystics. Of course, here the reader begins to say, 'But . . . but . . . but . . .' and the Dean has a sentence for him: 'We must remember that what the saints can recollect and describe is not the vision itself'. The Dean used to be called 'provocative'; he is still provocative in two senses—at times he irritates a little, but, what is much more important, he often provokes thought.

C. RYDER SMITH

### DODDRIDGE MAKES A SERMON

WHEN one has said all the much that is to be said of the amiable, eirenical, tolerant, and humane Dr Doddridge, his devotional literature, his hymns, and his pioneering in education, it remains that the reason for all other excellences was that pre-eminently he was always both a Teacher and a Preacher. The bicentenary of his death has been nobly celebrated in saying that. Let me celebrate the 250th anniversary of his birth on 26th June 1702 (he was almost exactly a year John Wesley's senior) by reviewing his teaching on preaching.

From four manuscripts of notes made by his students his lectures were published in 1804. There were some seventy-six pages of notes on topics we would generally refer to as Pastoral Theology, representing twenty-five lectures; of these, twelve were devoted to preaching.

Would anyone today normally publish lectures on sermon construction by a man who died over half a century before? Or could any tutor today approach the subject of Preaching by calling attention to the outstanding preachers of the last hundred years, with pithy advice on what to admire and imitate in their



styles? It says much for Doddridge that both these things are true of him. (And if one did, would twenty-one out of the chosen forty-eight examples be Anglican?) Does the strangeness of it mark Doddridge's age as utterly remote from ours? But it was very like ours. Devotion was cooling, faith dying, churches emptying. The Evangelical Revival began in the very year one of the manuscripts was dated, 1739. I dare to offer again the advice of Doddridge, partly because attention to preaching excellence is the best *preparatio evangelii*, and partly because he spoke to the preacher in that heavy dark hour before the dawn came. And we are I think in not so very different a case. Nor will many preachers today close their ears to a man who can say such things as: 'Do not preach the same sermon too often;' 'Preach your sermon over to your own souls;' 'Ask, what use can be made of my acquaintance with the world in this sermon.'

Though the lectures as a whole reflect the settled chapel life of Dissent, declining from its first glory, we seem to catch a glimpse of the first wave of the Methodist revival in his remarks about Lay Preachers: 'Do not content with them, nor inveigh against them. God has used many of them for excellent purposes, and we must not tie Him to our rules. Endeavour to outdo whatever is good in their own way. Consider what makes them popular, viz. preaching Christ, Free Grace, visiting, religious conversation, etc. Let all these be your care, for they are all your duty.' Strange sort of Calvinist to say that! Yet Calvinism was one of the subjects he advised his students not to preach about. 'Always take care to avoid representing God as a tyrant.' With it he numbered 'types, particular sins and duties'. Nor would he have sermons wasted on the doctrines of 'natural religion' on the one hand (this is noteworthy because his Academy was often criticized in later Methodist circles for devoting too much time to this), nor on the other on inexplicable mysteries such as the doctrine of the Trinity. 'Two or three sermons a ministry should suffice on the evidences of Christianity.' He was against 'feeding the people on roots and not fruits'.

Then, how should we choose our subject? His criterion is *Usefulness*, which is defined as 'edifying, and pertinent to a particular congregation'. Preach the privileges of the children of God—pardon, renovation, adoption, perseverance, providential care, access to God, communion with God. 'These subjects will impress the hearts of sinners (as a lancet concealed in a sponge), as well as raise the devout affections of true Christians.' Preach the Covenant of Grace, the Spirit and His operations, and, above all, Christ. And what a list of subjects there are that immediately relate to Him—the glories of His Person, His Incarnation, His 'understanding', His example, preaching, ministerial conduct, Passion, Death, Resurrection and Ascension. Even preach 'His relations, offices and characters'. These he enumerates, some strangely, as: 'Husband, Brother, Prophet, Priest, King, Physician, Shepherd, Captain, Strength, Head, Forerunner, Advocate, Friend, Saviour, Judge.' Do not omit the darker truths from your preaching, such as Death, Judgement, Eternity, and the evils of sin; but when you touch on them, 'display the terrors of the law, but seldom let them be the subject of the whole sermon'. Doddridge liked making a scripture character or occasion his sermon subject. 'They will often afford you natural occasions of saying useful things in a very inoffensive way.'

So much for the subject; next, the style. Here we note the distinction,

unreal to us, that the eighteenth century drew between *Style* and *Strain*. It was a difference analogous to ours between lower and higher criticism. Style related particularly to language, Strain to the tone of the whole discourse. Doddridge, one feels, like the rest of his age, tended perhaps too much to weight. His favourite words seem to be gravity and plainness. What he liked most about Tillotson (who was the preachers' model for most in those days) was that he was 'admirably clear, beyond almost any man'. But his own favourite was Atterbury, in whom he found 'nothing dark, nothing redundant, nothing deficient, nothing misplaced; trivial thoughts were avoided, uncommon ones set in a clear strong light in a few words'. Clarity is achieved by keeping sentences short. His advice is as detailed as to remark: 'Watch open vowels and clashing consonants, and a succession of short syllables.' We can approve this love of plainness and clarity. 'Wit is like offering a basket of flowers to a starving man. A sick man doesn't want an eloquent doctor, but one who will make him better.' Yet when he quotes two examples of a 'shocking' style, 'hissing the Almighty Poet off the stage' and 'tantalizing God with the golden fruits of repentance', I must confess to finding in them more bite and colour and effectiveness, than in the sort of thing of which he himself approved. In any case he warns against a stereotyped style: it needs varying with the subject, the parts of the sermon, the congregation, and its traditions.

As Dr Doddridge makes his sermon, our generation looks with perhaps the greatest interest at his introduction of what he calls 'strain', and defines 'the general manner in which a discourse is composed'. Six strains should find their way into every sermon. These are the *Argumentative*, the *Pathetic*, the *Insinuating*, the *Evangelical*, the *Spiritual and Experimental*, and the *Scriptural*. These clearly need explaining.

'Be often proving something; never expect that any of the things you advance will by an intelligent auditory be received merely on your word,' he says. 'But avoid too-numerous, abstracted, and too-artificially disposed arguments.' He reminds us of some of Wesley's sermons whose lay-out is perfectly syllogistic. A preacher today with only twenty-five minutes at his disposal must steer even more closely between the Scylla and Charybdis of arguing too little or too much.

We see what he means by *Pathetic* when he writes: 'Passions are the sails of the soul. The preacher should endeavour to fill them with a prosperous wind.' In what he calls pathetic strokes, we recognize our emotional touches. Reading Doddridge we feel that the eighteenth century, for all it was called the Age of Reason, distrusted emotion far less than the twentieth, that cynics are calling the Age of Emotion. It was the presence of this appeal to the emotions that made the sermon an address to people rather than a speculative essay. Doddridge's generation knew that no one listens to reason unless the emotions are properly roused.

The *Insinuating strain* is of course our 'wooing note'. It is 'the strain of our Blessed Redeemer and sometimes of St Paul'. 'It makes little noise and does great execution.' And how to go about it? 'Show them the workings of their own minds and passions: this needs deep reflection and great self acquaintance.' We know what he means, and so did the Woman of Samaria and the Pharisees who listened to the drama of Luke 15.

There is in the above a clear correspondence to intellect, emotion, and will. The second three strains cut across the first three. They concern the spirit rather than the mode of presentation. He would explain *Evangelical*: 'Let it be a maxim with you never to preach without introducing Christ and the Holy Spirit; rather digress as Paul does, rather than omit them.' The *Spiritual and Experiential* (to translate his phrase) connects closely with the *Insinuating*: 'Speak what you have felt in your own heart in some of your best seasons. . . . Study the Psalms. . . . Deal much in the description of Christian tempers. . . . Consider the various cases of soul, how convictions are introduced, how best preserved.' Good advice, I would submit, to moderns who feel called to the psychological approach in their preaching. And be *Scriptural*. The Bible is still a best-seller. Its illustrations and its texts have not lost all their ancient power. 'In every sermon shoot home one or two powerful scriptures: no arrow is more likely to pierce the heart.'

We listen perhaps less patiently as he tells us how to arrange our matter. Trite enough such things as: Have a clear Plan: distinct (and not too many) heads and subdivisions. . . . Each head should be memorable, of a few words with one leading word. . . . Avoid trite divisions. . . . Thought should be natural to the subject, and pursued in a natural order; popular too, in the best sense of the word as 'suited to the people'. But behind all this lies the implicit rule of always composing the sermon with a specific congregation in mind. Doddridge never underestimated his congregation. One feels he visualized among it a man with an intelligence the master of his own with a ruthlessly severe judgement. Not only had this intellect and judgement to be matched; the man must be edified too, and led gently and firmly. Also he felt for, and through, his people. 'Thoughts which suit one of your auditory you do know, often suit twenty you do not know.' In every sermon there should be at least one idea which will have all the effectiveness of being a new one to them. And ideally, your sermon subject should not only be well thought out beforehand, but well talked over.

And the delivery? Doddridge was not against the use of notes, only against their *servile* use. 'To be able to preach without notes raises a man's character. Accustom yourselves to look much about on your auditory.' Manner of speaking had on some people as much effect as a man's matter. He disliked affectation ('Do not *act* all you say'), but he demanded 'affection', by which he meant more than mere speaking the truth in love. He would quote Baxter: 'Nothing is more indecent than a dead preacher speaking to dead hearers the living truths of a living God,' or Bates: 'A blunt iron when red-hot will pierce deeper into a piece of wood than a much sharper one when it is cold.'

Is that stale advice?

R. KISSACK

## Recent Literature

*Primitive Gospel Sources*, by P. B. W. Stather Hunt. (James Clarke & Co., 18s.)

In this important book the author contends that, long before any of our four Gospels were written, an anthology of 'Testimonies' from the Old Testament and Apocrypha was in existence—the purpose of which was to show the correspondence between Messianic prophecies and their fulfilment in the sayings and doings of Jesus of Nazareth—that this anthology was habitually used by Paul, the authors of the First Epistle of Peter and of the Hebrews, and that all four Evangelists, not least the Fourth, were deeply influenced by it. For instance, he claims that in the original testimony-book, Genesis 1 was rendered, 'In the beginning, that is the Son, God created the heavens and the earth', the *Word* being the Son, for God said: 'Let there be light' (see Irenaeus: AP. 43). Whether we accept all our author's findings or not, it is certain that the phrase 'according to the Scriptures' (1 Corinthians 15<sup>3-4</sup>) was from the beginning an integral part of the apostolic *kerygma*. Mr Hunt argues that it was not until Paul had made his final break with the synagogue at Corinth, that the Apostle changed his strategy and preached 'Christ crucified' rather than 'Christ fulfilling the law and the prophets'. But would not evangelization by proof-text drop into the background when Paul left Jews for Greeks? Why trouble Greeks with the Old Testament? Yet, in the steady flow of 'dialogues' in the succeeding generation, all but one are based upon the outline of the first book of testimonies. Mr Hunt, following Dr Rendel Harris, identifies this with the 'oracles (*logia*) of the Lord' said by Papias to have been 'put together' by the apostle Matthew in Aramaic. However much a dialogue added to its contents, it never deviated from its order, and method. The truth seems to be that, however great the defects of the proof-text method, the instinct which prompted it is deeply Christian. If the whole Bible is the written word of God, neither Testament taken alone can bring us to a true understanding of the 'Word made flesh.' If the last chapter of Luke's Gospel gives us a true reflection of the mind of Jesus—as our author thinks it does—and if Matthew was the compiler of the first book of Testimonies, he deserves, even if he did not write the first Gospel, to be ranked with Paul and John as one of the most powerful primitive influences in Christian history, for he may be said to have made the Christian Bible what it is, and to have set the tone for the whole New Testament. Mr Hunt, agreeing with the Form-critics that the Gospel-stories existed as separate units before they were collected, argues that, with the exception of the Passion-story, they had at first little or no connexion with each other, but were selected because they corresponded to ideas current in the churches. What was the dominant idea which issued in the selection of these stories and no others? Our author has proved, we think, that it was the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth.

J. A. FINDLAY

*The Epistle to the Ephesians: its Authorship, Origin, and Purpose*, by C. Leslie Mitton. (Oxford Press, 30s.)

It was time that a new study of the Epistle to the Ephesians was attempted. Dr Leslie Mitton's work is a scholarly investigation of the questions of its authorship, destination, and date. He re-examines the arguments from style, vocabulary, and doctrine, which to some have seemed to support the Pauline authorship and to others to throw grave doubts upon it. He acknowledges that in themselves, as generally stated, they do not provide evidence sufficiently decisive on either side. He examines afresh, what have often been examined before, the parallels between Ephesians and

Colossians, and also the parallels on the one hand between Ephesians and the other Epistles, and on the other hand between Philippians and the other Epistles. The parallels are much more numerous in Ephesians, and are of such a nature, he thinks, that it seems as if Paul had his other letters before him, and was actually quoting from them, when he wrote Ephesians. This seems very unlikely, and strengthens the case of those who believe that another hand wrote Ephesians. Whose hand was it? The hand of one who owed very much to Paul, and who wrote what he believed was a genuine summary of Paul's Gospel, adding interpretations where necessary. Steeped as he was in Paul's letters, he wrote what he considered the essential Pauline message as a tract for the times, detached from the practical difficulties and problems which took up no small part of the letters of the Apostle himself. The author might have been a man of Colossae, who had close connexions with Ephesus. He had been influenced by Acts, and that means that his book could not have been written much earlier than the last decade of the first century—A.D. 87 to 92 is the period Dr Mitton suggests. His book was not really a letter, but an address in letter form, issued without a name; but, because of the author's associations with Ephesus, the traditional title was approximately correct. If it is not an Epistle of Paul, it might well be called the Gospel according to Paul. These are some of the points in Dr Mitton's thesis, which is argued persuasively and cogently. In two appendixes on the parallels already named he has underlined the relevant words and phrases. From these the reader can see for himself the literary *data* which Dr Mitton thinks give valuable support to his denial of Pauline authorship. While scholars like E. J. Goodspeed and John Knox have earlier sponsored some such theory of authorship, no other has so thoroughly examined and sifted the evidence. Even if Dr. Mitton may not succeed in convincing all his readers of the non-Pauline authorship, he has made out a strong and persuasive case for it. This book establishes his reputation as a New Testament scholar of whom much is to be expected.

F. B. CLOGG

*The Seal of the Spirit*, a study in the doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers, by G. W. H. Lampe. (Longmans, 35s.)

Mr Lampe, a Fellow of St John's College, Oxford, is already widely known as an outstanding scholar. The present book must be the harvest of years of wide reading and deep study, not only of the New Testament but in the patristic field as well. In every section of the Church at the present time there is much discussion about the doctrine of Baptism, and not a little concern about the anomalies which mark its administration. This book will greatly help us both in the understanding of the biblical doctrine, and of the way in which the New Testament doctrine was disintegrated in the teaching and practice of later centuries. Its four divisions deal with the Seal of the Spirit in the New Testament, the Sealing of the Faithful in the Early Church, the Sacramental Reception of the Holy Spirit, and Patristic Theories of Sealing. In Anglican Theology both Fr F. W. Puller and Dr J. A. Mason argued long since that in Baptism the gifts of grace are received, in Confirmation the Spirit Himself. In quite recent years this theory has been revived by Dom Gregory Dix, the present reviewer being at first favourably impressed by his lecture on *The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism*. It seemed to offer a solution to the problem which arises from the confusion between the language used in the New Testament about the baptism of converts and its application to infant baptism in the almost universal practice of the Church. Dix's argument was that, when the Christian family became the norm rather than individual converts from paganism, a distinction, inherent in the New Testament, between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism led to the separation of the one process into two rites, Baptism and Confirmation. Mr Lampe has proved,



with immense learning, that this theory cannot be sustained by scripture or by an accurate study of the Fathers. One interesting feature of this discussion is its relation to the problem of Reunion. Fr L. S. Thornton has objected to a statement in an Anglican Report that the blessings conferred by Baptism are not withheld till the later rite of Confirmation, his ground being that Confirmation is administered by the Bishop, whereas the validity of Trinitarian Baptism is independent of the episcopate. This rouses Mr Lampe to an indignant protest against the 'monstrous conclusion' that involves 'the unchurching of an immense number of our fellow-believers'. Progress in the ecumenical movement 'demands a mutual recognition by the severed bodies that they are true parts of the internally divided Church of Christ; but on Thornton's view no non-episcopal body, and no Church whose Bishops cannot claim to represent the "apostolic ministry", possesses the Holy Spirit'. While this book requires of its readers close study, it is one of the most distinguished gifts of the finest Anglican scholarship that we have received for some time past. No serious thinker about Church Reunion can afford to neglect it.

W. F. HOWARD

*Biblical Authority for Today*, Edited by A. Richardson and W. Schweitzer. (S.C.M. Press. 18s.)

The nineteen contributors to this symposium are drawn from various nationalities—American, British, Continental, Indian—and most of the main Christian traditions, apart from Rome. The book is an outcome of a number of conferences held by the Study Department of the World Council of Churches. In its first part seven distinguished scholars deal with the nature of biblical authority. In some cases it is perhaps questionable whether they can be taken as thoroughly representative of their denominations. The Dean of Drew, for instance, who furnishes the most 'liberal' contribution, would fail to carry many Methodists with him. Yet his essay's approach could be found in most denominations in some measure, for at times the dividing lines run across denominational frontiers. In the second part of the book a single essay surveys the main trends in present-day thought concerning biblical theology and ethics. In the third part, five contributors discuss the principles of the interpretation of the Bible, while a sixth resumes the points of agreement under this head reached at one of the Ecumenical Study Conferences. In the last part of the book, the remaining essayists handle such practical questions as the biblical attitude to property, the rule of law, the relations of Church and State, and race problems. The differences between the various writers, especially in their conceptions of the authority of the Bible, are considerable. There are marked divergences regarding the validity of natural theology and natural law, and the weight to be assigned to tradition. Yet the remarkably encouraging statement of agreements lends support to the view that the modern revival of biblical theology is one of the most hopeful features of the ecumenical scene. This important book ought to be widely studied and discussed.

PHILIP S. WATSON

*Humanity and Deity*, by Wilbur Marshall Urban. (Allen & Unwin, 25s.)

To the outer barbarian, all philosophy is dull. At the next stage the glitter of writers who deliberately set out to captivate beginners, such as Joad and Dorothy Sayers and C. S. Lewis, may fascinate us. Then we may learn to sense the thrill of originality in the writings of the masters of philosophy, even when their style is crabbed. The same authentic philosophical thrill can be found too in the masterly exponents of old, orthodox positions, such as A. E. Taylor and William Temple. But sometimes the glow is just not there, though a vast deal of solid merit is. There are philosophers of

learning, acumen, breadth of experience, depth of feeling, and power of handling their matter on the large scale, yet whose books stick in one's gullet, and such is Professor Urban's latest book. It is certainly an essay on the grand scale and it covers much of the field of Christian philosophy; its learning is adequate to each of its parts, and, as there are many parts, this is admirable; its findings on nearly all of the many subjects it touches are wonderfully sane and balanced; but it is all so dull. One could point out special excellencies—it finds something fresh to say on the ontological argument; it is one of the many modern books that rightly recall us to Aquinas, and one of the few that equally rightly recall us to Höfding and Balfour; it draws a distinction between 'hypothesis' and 'postulate' that should be of much use in the problem of certainty. One could also point out special blemishes—the chapter on myth has no merit except that of seeing the importance of its subject; the chapter on symbol muddles up symbol and analogy; the book is less than fair to McTaggart and unusually lenient to Leibniz as a religious thinker. But in a book on this scale such things, on either side, are minor. While the present reviewer could wish that he had never had to read it, it is a marvellously sound book, full of carefully won and scrupulously argued truth on subjects where error abounds, and therefore it is an important book.

J. F. BUTLER

*Ralph Cudworth: an Interpretation*, by J. A. Passmore. (Cambridge University Press, 15s.)

Although written for students of philosophy, this book is equally pertinent to students of theology, since Cudworth belongs to both fields. By no means too much has been written on the Cambridge Platonists in general or on Cudworth in particular. Professor Passmore is concerned primarily with his ethics, in order to correct both the inadequacy and the errors in the usual scanty accounts. There can be no doubt that the writer has achieved his aim, the chief reason being that he alone has worked through the unpublished Cudworth MSS. (of which he gives a careful description in an appendix) in the British Museum. It is to be hoped that he will transcribe and publish these when conditions become favourable. We shall no longer have to think of Cudworth, for instance, as a scholar facing only backwards, and as an arch-rationalist deducing ethics from abstractions. Three points in the exposition may be taken as samples: (1) Cudworth's interest in the Puritans. On the one hand he saw them as representing the possibility of legitimate diversity in the moral and religious life and, unlike Whichcote and very many others, he approved *some* of their 'enthusiasm'; on the other hand, he felt with the rest of the Cambridge group a humanistic recoil against their narrowness, protesting against their (as well as Hobbes's) 'villainization of human nature', and against their making a high duty of every trivial occasion. His ethic is not one of duty, but of loving response to whatever is intrinsically excellent. (2) His psychology of the moral life is largely empirical. Reason is not a motive: motives come from our lower nature and from grace, ends being presented to thought, not by thought. Besides, a good end is chosen, not by an intellect cut loose from all passion, but by a 'vital disposition' of the whole mind. The limitations on our freedom of choice are amply recognized, and such freedom as we have, Cudworth argues, is not to be conceived—any more for ethics than for science—as 'liberty of indifference'. (3) His honesty of thought is illustrated by some of his unresolved difficulties, e.g. that of reconciling his rationalist conviction of the utter objectivity, even to God's mind, of moral distinctions with a non-voluntaryistic theology—in other words, the difficulty of completely theologizing ethics without some tincture of voluntarism. The book is so excellent that only its brevity can be complained of. There is sound scholarship here; the style is perfectly lucid; the temper is gracious—there being none of the aggressive cleverness that has marred much of our recent philosophical writing;

and it is lit up, as any sensitive book on any Cambridge Platonist must be, with memorable quotations memorably expressed, which delight both intellect and soul.

T. E. JESSOP

*Psychology, Religion, and Healing*, by Leslie D. Weatherhead. (Hodder & Stoughton, 25s.)

This is Dr Weatherhead's best book. It is the outcome both of wide reading and research and of an intimate knowledge of human problems gained through a most effective ministry of psychological and spiritual healing. It includes an account of the history of healing from the earliest times, and of the various methods of healing employed. The reader is reminded that all healing, whether by material or non-material methods, is of God. This is salutary, for many 'spiritual healers' claim that their particular methods alone are in harmony with the mind of Christ. Yet the evidence that healing often takes place by non-material means is beyond question, and Dr Weatherhead sets it forth convincingly. It is easy to believe that as psychiatry shows, psychosomatic diseases can be cured through mental means, but most psychiatrists would still hold that where what looks like an organic disease is healed through suggestion or 'faith', the disease is in fact hysterical or psychogenic. They also point out that what is pronounced a cure may be merely the removal of a symptom, only to be followed later by a symptom of a different kind. Dr Weatherhead, however, has no doubt that true physical illnesses can and have been cured by spiritual means. Such a book as 'He Heals Today' by Elsie Salmon, which has provoked such wide comment, strongly supports this contention. It is not possible to understand all the factors that make possible the healing (by non-material means) of diseases pronounced 'incurable' by the doctors. But medical science recognizes the close relationship between body and mind. Resentments, fears and conflicts can throw the whole personality out of harmony, and bring on bodily pains and disease. When that is so, the healing of the mind ought to result in freedom from the bodily symptoms. In 'faith healing' meetings, and under the guidance of skilled psychiatrists, this is constantly taking place. Further, the tremendous power of suggestion as a cause of both illness and healing is recognized. This power is strengthened through the display of crutches and medical appliances left in healing centres by patients who have been healed. It is further strengthened by religious ceremonies, and by a heightened spiritual atmosphere such as Dr Weatherhead describes as characteristic of Lourdes. Suggestion always seems to be an element in faith. If faith, in one of its senses, is 'trustful expectancy', suggestion is also dependent on expectancy. But there is a difference between suggestion and faith and Dr Weatherhead's treatment of this difficult subject is one of the best features of his book. Again, the chapter on 'The Healing Miracles of the New Testament' contains the best treatment of this subject which we know. Dr Weatherhead properly claims that these miracles cannot all be paralleled by similar cures effected by modern psychological methods. They are explained 'partly because of what Jesus was Himself and partly because of the response He could win from the patient by the outpouring of Divine love.' This book is worthy of the praise it has received in medical journals as well as in the religious press. Though written as a thesis, it is as readable as any of Dr Weatherhead's former books, and that is saying much. It is to be commended warmly.

W. L. NORTHRIDGE

*Nervous Disorders and Religion*, by J. G. McKenzie. (Allen & Unwin, 9s. 6d.)

Dr McKenzie's book contains six lectures delivered at Manchester College, Oxford, the title being taken from the last lecture. The rest deal with original human nature, conflicts, guilt, and spiritual healing. Dr McKenzie takes what he calls a personalist

position in his psychology, and justly insists that a man as a whole must be the subject of any proper psychological treatment. He has advanced beyond the tacit assumption of the psychoanalysts that diagnosis ought to be cure, and is sympathetic toward the newer method of counselling, directed toward the patient's readjustment in life. The weakness of the psychoanalytic method is that the analyst, having dug out some happening of the past and confidently named it as the reason for the neurosis (which it may or may not be), seems never to face the fact that similar experiences befall others who, none the less, do not become neurotic. The re-education or re-alignment of the patient to life is far more important than hunting for something in the patient's past to which to attach the complex. Dr McKenzie differentiates spiritual from mental healing by saying that the former lays emphasis on the general spiritual state of the patient and teaches that power may come from a source other and greater than self. He makes the interesting suggestion that Spearman's neo-genetic principles, especially that of correlated educts, answer Freud's crudities in respect of the conception of God. Spearman argues that when we have a known factor which has a known relation, our minds tend naturally to educe a co-related idea. Thus there might come the idea of God, since such co-relates are not by any means always empirical, but may from experience transcend experience. Altogether this is a valuable and suggestive book. There are few blemishes. Dr Gote Bergsten is referred to as Borgsten, and, as the author acknowledges various helpers, it is a pity that one of them did not compile an index for him. But for all else—much thanks.

E. S. WATERHOUSE

*Submission in Suffering*, and other essays in Eastern Thought, by H. H. Rowley.  
(University of Wales Press, 12s. 6d.)

In this book a well-known Old Testament scholar enters the field of Comparative Religion. There are three long chapters, the first giving the title to the whole work, the second dealing with Chinese Sages and the Golden Rule, and the third with the Chinese Philosopher Mo Ti. It would not be easy to find a scholar better equipped linguistically than Professor Rowley. A period on the staff of a Chinese university gave him his competence in Chinese. He is, of course, a master in Semitic languages, and in this book excerpts from six or seven European tongues are left untranslated! Only Russian, which is relatively unimportant, Sanskrit, and Pali, remain 'inaccessible' to our author—yet the section dealing with Brahmanism and Buddhism seems to me by no means the least masterly. It is certainly a relief to see Semitic, Indian, and Chinese thought so fruitfully compared. Space forbids more than mere mention of the careful treatment of the first and main theme in this well-documented volume. He would, however, be a well-read Orientalist who did not profit by the discriminating treatment of Karma. The freshest pages are those that show the importance of context in estimating the worth of the various Chinese expressions of the Golden Rule. Dr Rowley's careful conclusion is 'that among China's sages there is none that can offer a true parallel to the Golden Rule of the Gospels, and that when the content, motive, and strength for the execution of the maxim or its supposed equivalents are examined, the widest differences at once appear'. The chapter on the Chinese Philosopher Mo Ti will probably appeal most to non-specialists. His neglect in China itself has long been a problem to those acquainted with his irenic philosophy and more than Confucian sense of the Moral Order. As to the West, now that scholars—Chinese, Japanese, and European—have burst through his crabbed style, he may well become the most popular of all Chinese ancient writers, Mencius and Chuang Tzu perhaps excepted. Of very few Chinese sages can it be said as of Mo Tzu: 'The Heaven that is marked by a loving will, and that cherishes a moral purpose, and

that not alone makes high demands of men but exemplifies the qualities it asks of them, is no mere impersonal force, but a living and personal Power.'

W. LONGDEN OAKES

*The Religions of Mankind*, by Edmund Davison Soper. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via Epworth Press, \$3.50.)

To compress the history of the religions of the world into a single medium-size volume is a task which the wisdom of Solomon could not accomplish. But even when a quart is poured into a pint jug, the contents of the jug may be tested. From this point of view it would be hard to do better than Dr Soper has done. He knows his subject, and what is rarer, knows what to choose from it to put into a limited space. He keeps out nothing essential in order to include other things. There is little ground for adverse comment saving that it would have been better to have adopted the spelling used by the Royal Asiatic Society and Hastings's *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. Dr Soper is factual rather than critical. None will complain of bias or false emphasis. One is glad to see that he refers to the belief of that great scholar, the late Mrs Rhys Davids, that in Buddhism the 'no-soul' doctrine, like the so-called atheism of Gotama, was an accretion. It is far more probable that the original teaching was that man has not a static soul, but is a becoming rather than a being. Dr Soper refers to Lao-Tzu as Laocius, but it is doubtful whether the name of Lao-Tzu can now be latinized. The final chapter is on Christianity. It is too short, necessarily, to be of much use, and it might have been omitted, so as to give more space to things less familiar, though logically the title of the book includes it. A final estimate is that this book is well worth reading by all who want a general knowledge of the religions of mankind.

E. S. WATERHOUSE

*Facing the Future in West Africa*, by Harry Belshaw. (Cargate Press, 3s. 6d.)

In this book of 120 pages a Methodist Missionary from the Gold Coast seeks to present a coherent picture of the changes that are taking place in contemporary West Africa and to show how the Methodist Church is meeting the new situation. There is here both cause for deep thankfulness to God and a challenge to the Church. Mr Belshaw's case would have been strengthened if he had given greater emphasis to the poverty and ill-health which, as many testify, are two of the most striking features of contemporary Africa. It is not until we are half way through the book that we read of the low standard of living, or are given any idea of the extent of the disease and ignorance which perhaps more than anything else are holding up Africa's advance. These things are the present fate of a people who are said to 'match nature in their virility and vigour'. Professor Macmillan's brilliantly written little book *Africa Emergent* (Pelican books), and *West Africa*, a trade journal, notable for the spirit and cogency of its leading articles, might have found a place in the book list. But the message of this book cannot fail to come home to the heart of all who read it.

KENNETH H. CROSBY

*Ways of Worship*, edited by P. Edwall, E. Hayman, and W. D. Maxwell. (S.C.M. Press, 21s.)

One of the international Theological Commissions appointed after the Second World Conference on Faith and Order, held in 1937, has now published this report, to provide material for discussion at the Third World Conference at Lund this year. The report itself only fills some twenty-four pages, but it is followed by twenty-six essays, by members of all the main Christian Communion, on the Elements of



Liturgy, the Inner Meanings of Word and Sacrament, and the Interaction of Liturgy and Devotion as it is seen in Mariology. Finally there is a paper showing that an attempt ought also to be made to study the Church's various traditions of devotional practice. (The practical steps proposed for this purpose have already been taken.) As will be expected, the essays reveal, not only the extraordinary diversity of the ways of worship within Christendom, but the sharp cleavages between many of them. These, however, are discussed with courtesy and charity, and assumptions based on suspicion or prejudice are very rare. Happily the evidence reveals progress as well as differences. Sometimes it is the movement of the whole Church in the same direction—e.g. in the abundant signs of new liturgical interest, and of the truer sense of corporateness, which are both found among all Communion today. Often, too, the movement is a drawing of various parts of the Church toward one another's emphasis. Thus a Roman writer places preaching among the sacraments, an Anglo-Catholic approves of 'free prayer in which any of the worshippers are free to engage', an Orthodox welcomes a revival of preaching, and the Protestants generally place a new stress on Holy Communion. It is made clear too, that an increased understanding of the Bible is bringing theologians into greater agreement, and that there is at the same time a growing recognition that we all live on tradition more than we think we do. The report itself, distinguishing between those differences in ways of worship whose origin is cultural, psychological, or temperamental, and those which reflect doctrines that appear to be stubbornly incompatible, points out that only the latter can justify the separation of Churches, and that these present precisely the kind of problem which the Conference at Lund will assemble to discuss.

J. ALAN KAY

*Writings from the Philokalia.* Translated by E. Kadloubovsky and G. E. H. Palmer. (Faber & Faber, 30s.)

A little volume entitled *The Way of a Pilgrim* (S.P.C.K.) made its appearance in English some twenty-five years ago. In his search for a spiritual director who could expound the meaning of St Paul's injunction to 'pray without ceasing', the Pilgrim came across a *staretz* who read to him part of the *Philokalia*. In the volume under review portions explaining the *rationale* of such prayer are now made available to English readers. Here there are to be found directions in what the Fathers called 'the art of arts and the science of sciences' as practised by the Hesychasts on Mount Athos. It is a method of knowing oneself, controlling the errant mind and enlarging the consciousness by the constant repetition of the words, 'Lord Jesus Christ, have mercy upon me', and then (ceasing the oral repetition) by bringing the words into the heart and synchronizing them with the heart-beats. In course of time the prayer becomes wordless and proceeds automatically, bringing both interior delight and light to the devotee. Purity of intention and an inflexible persistence are essentials to success. The writings of the Fathers given here deal comprehensively with every aspect of the subject.

JOHN EARLE

*Florence Allshorn and the Story of St Julian's*, by J. H. Oldham. (S.C.M. Press, 12s. 6d.)

Marion Fox, *Quaker, a selection of her letters*, edited by Hubert Fox. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.)

Florence Allshorn was left an orphan at the age of three. As the home of her adoption was not a calm home, she believed she could tackle a mission station with more equanimity than most people. Even so, in her first appointment to Africa she discovered that the whole missionary endeavour was brought to nought because a

fellow missionary, a woman of an impossible temperament, was so prone to dark, terrifying moods, that an old native matron could say: 'I have been on this station for fifteen years and I have seen you come out, all of you, saying you have brought to us a Saviour, but I have never seen this situation saved yet'. It was this encounter with the problems of human relationship which gave the bent to all Florence Allshorn's future work for Christ, at home and abroad. She trained young missionaries for the Church Missionary Society with this problem uppermost in her mind. Later the solving of this same problem led her to found St Julian's, near Horsham, as a centre of Christian community life, and a guest house for all tired Church workers, at home and abroad. Florence believed that beauty was an attribute of God and St Julian's was beautiful both within and without. Her experience of Christ forbade anything shoddy or slipshod. It was expressed in perfect flowers, in polished tables, in crisp overalls, and even, as she says, 'In the actual attitude and deed over a saucepan'. To a slovenly worker she would say: 'How can you go to the Prayer Room and leave a sink like that?' Her life was a quest for reality in living the life of Christ in every sphere of work and leisure. Her method is more fruitful, although more exacting, than any whirlwind campaign of impersonal evangelism, for 'those who possess truth because they have lived it are sought by others, whereas those who are chiefly concerned with the propagation of a doctrine have to seek an audience'. The leaven of Florence Allshorn's life and teaching so worked at St Julian's that it was always full. When Dr Oldham heard Professor Dodd's description of the divine Master in a Broadcast talk, he thought instinctively of Florence Allshorn. We are under a great debt to Dr Oldham for showing us this saint.

In the second book we are back in the old established ways of the Quaker faith. There is here a settled fellowship and an habitual peace which needs no struggling after to achieve. These letters are full of devotion to the unfortunate. Marion Fox did a great work in establishing friendly relationships with war-tormented Germany. She believed quite simply, put into practice, the momentous doctrine that 'Even in war-time whoever needs our help is our neighbour, and love of their enemies remains the distinguishing mark of those who keep faith with Our Lord.' Marion Fox, born in Somerset in 1861, died there in 1949 after a life-time spent in 'doing the impossible, believing the incredible, and hoping when there is no hope'. Her letters run true to the Quaker faith at its very best.

G. ELSIE HARRISON

*Vacant Possession*, by Geoffrey L. Heawood. (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.);

*The Life of Christ*, by H. A. Guy. (Macmillan, 6s. 6d.);

*Gospel Facts and Doctrine*, by C. F. Hogg. (Pickering & Inglis, 5s. 6d.);

*The Way into The Kingdom*, by Frederick W. Shaw. (The Epworth Press, 5s.)

Today godless creeds have wrought so much havoc that men are examining again the nature of their Christian heritage. But with the readiness to learn goes a feeling of bewilderment. What is Christianity? While the answer is simple—It is a faith, an experience, and a way of life—to know the details of that faith, to enter into that experience, and to follow that way, are not so simple. These four little books together provide guidance to the bewildered. Mr Heawood, a Headmaster, rightly declares that many of the young are growing up today without any clear guidance in faith and living. With this in mind, he faces the problems set to teachers by official educational policy on religion and by the conflicting voices of a divided Church. His book answers the questions: 'What is necessary for (the Christian) experience of life, to awaken it, and to maintain it?' 'What essential beliefs express it, and in what actions does it issue?' 'What sort of fellowship is necessary for its full reality, and what worship is essential?' This book, with its depth of thought, its simplicity and charm,

and its dignity of style, could not easily be bettered. Mr Harold Guy's *Life of Christ* is an invaluable guide to the teaching of Jesus and the Gospel narratives concerning Him. It begins with background material—literary, historical, religious, and political. Then it divides the first three Gospels into 173 sections, each with its appropriate notes and critical comments. A section follows which deals with the narrative portions of the Fourth Gospel. There are cross-references, indexes, and a carefully selected list of works for further reading. This is an ideal handbook for the average student and a most useful aid to the busy teacher, though some readers may not agree with his account of the birth stories, the miracles and the apocalyptic passages. Mr C. F. Hogg's *Gospel Facts and Doctrines* is a collection of articles from *The Witness* and *The Believer's Magazine*. For the confirmed Christian it is a thorough and useful presentation and interpretation of scripture passages on forgiveness, cleansing, justification, propitiation, redemption, reconciliation, sanctification, adoption, the Person of Christ, and His Death and Resurrection. Mr Shaw's book, an attempt to show the way in which Jesus led his disciples into a deeper spiritual and transmissible experience, consists of his own (too literal) translation of the latter part of Mark's gospel and the first chapters of the Acts, together with prayers and meditations arising from each passage. It is a record of the writer's private devotions which may well help others.

RALPH KIRBY

*Arrows of Desire*, by F. W. Boreham (5s.); *Give God something to build on*, by Winship Storey (6s.); *Those who find*, by Allen Birtwhistle (5s.); *The Promise of Jesus*, by William J. May (5s.); *The Joy-stick*, by H. W. Goldsack (5s.); *Children who knew Jesus*, by Yvonne St Clair (5s.). (The Epworth Press.)

'So this is Spurgeon!' is the title of a chapter in Dr Boreham's book. As the great Baptist preacher accomplished great things without organ and choir, so 'Boreham' has done a service to the Faith by the simple characterization of ordinary people and events without the heavier accompaniments. Another essay on 'The Grand Old Man' readily suggests a tribute which many readers would like to pay to the author himself. In spite of his eighty years his latest book has the same charm and deft touches as have so often won the admiration of the many folk who learn religion in a non-theological school. . . . The title of the late Mr Winship Storey's book makes us want to read it. To follow him as he lays stone to stone is to find that the Christian life is fashioned and constructed by the Master Builder. Christ has an 'Artistry of Redemption', which is not ornamental but means being 'Ransomed—Healed—Restored—Forgiven'. In Christ, the believer is 'Living in his element', as Mr Storey puts it, by a 'Faith that still works miracles'. There is substance and sustenance in this splendid little book. . . . Modern Methodism is tending toward a firmer emphasis on the historical faith which finds its culmination in Holy Communion. The Rev. Allen Birtwhistle has not only used Bernard of Clairvaux's hymn to grand effect but has made a searching contribution to the classic trend of our Churchmanship. *Those who find* is enriched by drawing upon 'the writings of Christians who have travelled farther than most of us in their journey to the final goal'—e.g. Augustine of Hippo and Thomas à Kempis. This is a book to put into the hands of devout and thoughtful young folk. . . . The Rev. William J. May bids fair to rival Dr Boreham in his output and neat capacity to say things simply and happily. In his latest volume he has written not only for Women's Meetings but also for the quiet place where those are blessed who 'Ask, Seek, Knock'. . . . A second edition of *The Joy-stick* speaks for itself. Here is something more than a set of attractive children's addresses. Mr Goldsack provides excellent material for full-scale services which are wholly for Youth. He has the rare gift of talking to 'teen-agers' in a simple, arresting, and inspiring way. . . . *Children who knew Jesus* deals with a well-worked

theme but this latest addition is quite up to standard and perhaps gains a little in being about imaginary children. The stories of Joseph and Mary's journey to Jerusalem and of the Boy Jesus in the temple are sympathetically told and set the tone for the whole book. The Nativity Stories are placed near the end but nothing seems to be lost by this strange juxtaposition.

C. LESLIE BREWER

---

## *From My New Shelf*

N.B.—For lack of space it has only been possible to give short notices of a number of important books.

*Gospel and Law*, by C. H. Dodd (Cambridge Press, 9s.). In these four 'Bampton Lectures in America' Professor Dodd examines the relations between the *kerugma* and the ethical part of the *didache* in the New Testament. He begins by showing that there the order is—first, the preaching of the new historical facts; then the explanation of these facts (which leads to theology); and finally the kind of conduct that this explanation requires. Beginning from the Epistles as the earliest documents, he shows that there is a 'family likeness' among their brief alphabets of conduct for converts newly won from heathenism. Next, he shows that for the first Christians, there was a distinctive kind of ethics which was the more urgent because they lived under the constant expectation of the imminent end of the world. This ethic he describes under the headings 'the body of Christ', 'the imitation of Christ' (where he shows that 'imitation' does not mean a mere outward copying), and *agape*. Turning to the Synoptic Gospels, he depicts Jesus' way of teaching principles through striking concrete instances, as in the Parables, and then considers the ethical teaching itself, chiefly in the Sermon on the Mount. Finally, returning to Paul, he discusses the two meanings of 'the law written on the heart' as over against 'the law written in a *gramma* (book, not letter)'.

Professor Dodd is *emeritus* now, but his eye has not lost its keenness nor his hand its cunning. The expected signs are here—for instance, his exact scholarship, his lucidity, the integration of the teaching of the several parts of the New Testament, and a challenge to one or two accepted opinions. Without naming Barth, he agrees with him here and disagrees there. Two queries may be ventured. Does not the lecturer 'put the cart before the horse', when he says that a man is 'in Christ' if he is a 'real member of Christ's body'? Is not a man 'in Christ' when he lives in personal fellowship with Christ and is *thereby* a 'member of His body'? In 1 Corinthians 12 Paul does not say that the 'hand', for example, is 'in' the body, but 'of (*ek*) the body'. Again, the lecturer assumes that when Paul calls Christ 'the head of the church', he means that Christ rules the Church as a man's head, considered as the seat of his mind, rules his body. But does this suit Ephesians 5<sup>23</sup> (cf. 1 Peter 3<sup>6</sup>)? Again, in the New Testament it is the 'heart' that is the seat of the mind and will, as well as of the feelings. This needs full documentation, and I can only say that I have attempted this in *The Bible Doctrine of Man*. In 1 Corinthians 12 it is not the head but the Spirit (corresponding to a man's 'spirit' conceived as in his body) through whom Christ rules the Church. Perhaps the lecture on 'The Law of Christ' is the finest in a fine book. Here Professor Dodd brings the Sermon on the Mount under the dialectical concept of 'judgement and grace', quoting Matthew 7<sup>24-7</sup> to show that it is no lovely but impracticable ideal, and leading up to the truth that the Christian's life may have

the same 'quality and direction' as God's own. It would be idle to commend this book, but ought there not to be an index of texts?

*Tradition and the Spirit*, by Daniel Jenkins (Faber & Faber, 12s. 6d.). A doctrine of history involves doctrines of authority and tradition, and, if it be a Christian doctrine, of the Old Testament and the Spirit. Mr Jenkins deals with tradition in this context, except that he does not compare and contrast tradition in the Church with that in other societies. For him, the Church, being in some degree inevitably sinful, is never infallible. For him, again, no present 'historical situation' ever merely repeats the past, and therefore tradition is never a *certain* guide. In consequence, tradition, which Mr Jenkins with the Greek Church calls 'the stream of the Church's life,' must combine continuity with change. The Church must always seek the guidance of the Spirit—not only by direct prayer but from every available source—and then, even though she can never fully understand what that guidance is, must take her risks in faith. Mr Jenkins would rather call the Church a 'movement' than an 'organism,' but is she not both? As he goes along, he praises every church for some things and blames it for others. Of course his chief criticism falls on Rome, with her 'static' doctrine of tradition, but he can praise her too. He applies his doctrine in several ways (developing, for instance, an interesting novel doctrine of infant baptism), but his chief concern is with the almost omniscient technocracy of today. He calls for crusaders, both lay and ministerial, who will 'tradition' that world with Christianity. Here faith needs to 'laugh at impossibilities and cry—"It shall be done",' but is not Mr Jenkins right? While he does not integrate the complementary doctrine of the infallible Spirit, he implies it. There is exigent need for a Protestant doctrine of tradition, and Mr Jenkins has grappled with it, for 'grappled' is the right word. His book is not its 'Omega', but it is its true 'Alpha'—and much more.

*The Church of the New Testament*, by L. G. Champion (Carey Kingsgate Press, 7s. 6d.). Mr Champion looks at the New Testament with his own eyes. Free Churchmen will agree with me that his are very good eyes, unless it be under Baptism. He gives about half his book to 'The Christian Movement', beginning with Jesus, for he rightly holds that the Church cannot be understood except as part of a larger whole. Here is a book for those who ask for 'a simple account of the Church.' Mr Champion is an expert who has the skill to be simple.

*Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Poem of Job*, by William Barron Stevenson (Aberdeen University Press). In his Schweich Lectures Professor Stevenson not only advocated an unusual account of the Poem of Job, but provided a new translation based on an amended text. These learned notes were written to 'justify' that text, but they will be invaluable to every advanced student of Job.

*The Sephardim of England*, by Albert M. Hyamson (Methuen & Co., 35s.). In Tudor times, although Jews were forbidden to settle in England, Sephardim (Jews of the Mediterranean lands) began to trickle in from Spain and Portugal. Cromwell gave their growing numbers liberty to worship, and in 1701 they built a synagogue in Bevis Marks, London, which is still the headquarters of their community. Mr Hyamson describes the history of the four centuries in very great detail, setting down everything, good and bad. Behind the detail a discerning reader will trace an interesting and instructive story. There are many side-lights on life in London—e.g. at one time a respected Jew might be made parish church-warden, and for long no Jew was permitted to ply retail trade in the City. Disraeli's father left the community because, on his refusing an office that entailed regular attendance at the Synagogue, he was ordered to pay the customary fine.

*Disciples of All Nations, The Story of Christian Expansion*, by Basil Matthews (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.). This book, the fruit of forty years' study, was in the press when its



author died last year. There is no need to say that a book by Basil Matthews is accurate, lucid, and graphic. What an eye he had for the significant detail! Beginning with Paul, he gives more than half the book to the last century and a half. There are seven maps. Probably this is the best short book on the history of Missions.

*The Christian Mission*, by Max Warren (S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d.). What is the Church to do in the present world situation? What am I to do now? Mr Warren's answer—clear, catholic, challenging, *concrete*—is the best that I know. He salts his book with modern instances, and specially stresses the world-wide call of Christ for groups of keen Christians, living in the same neighbourhood, united for a specific purpose, and ready for a common cross.

*The Church of South India*, by A. E. J. Rawlinson (Hodder & Stoughton, 7s. 6d.). In these Lichfield Lectures the Bishop of Derby explains, primarily to Anglicans, how the Church of South India came to be and what it is. Its optional 'Service of the Lord's Supper, or the Holy Eucharist' is appended. This will especially interest students of liturgy.

*They Do Likewise*, edited by Donald S. Ching (Cargate Press, 4s.). In Africa British Methodism has medical Missions in Kenya, Sierra Leone, and two parts of Nigeria. Mr Ching has gathered materials from seven Missionaries and woven them into a fine tapestry. I think the accounts of lepers and of 'women labouring of child' moved me most. There are nine good illustrations and two maps.

*A Church Born to Suffer*, by John Rose (Cargate Press, 5s.). In the crowded pages of this little book John Rose tells the story of 'the First Hundred Years of the Methodist Church in South China'. It has fought its passage through storm after storm after storm. 'Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.'

*Africa Steps Out*, by Ronald K. Orchard (Cargate Press, 3s. 6d.). Mr Orchard gives most of his book to a comprehensive and convincing account of the chaos that the impact of the west, in multitudinous ways, has made of the African way of life. But the purpose of it all is to ask 'Africa Steps Out—Where?', and to urge the church to give Christ's answer—which includes the *whole* of life (e.g. community, industry, and education). Mr Orchard illustrates from many a telling incident. When the United Council for Missionary Education asked him to write this book, they knew their man.

*Biology, Man, and God*, by Roger Pilkington (Lutterworth Press, 5s.). I am a tyro in science, but, as this expert's book is meant for tyros, I read it. And I understood every word in it (except 'isoprophylalcohol',—and this is used to puzzle theologians!) What is more, I was 'intrigued' to the end—e.g. by the bit about putting blacking on one of the eyes of a house-fly. Dr Pilkington shows the vast inadequacy of the theory that finds the *whole* explanation of evolution in 'natural selection'—most of all in the story of man. For this scientist Christ is the 'light which illuminates the darkness of evolution'.

*William Clowes, 1780–1851*, by John T. Wilkinson (The Epworth Press, 6s.). Along with Hugh Bourne, William Clowes, who went to work in a pottery at ten, founded Primitive Methodism. Mr Wilkinson, using the sources and quoting often from Clowes' *Journals*, has told the story with a scholar's care. He just states the old lamentable facts about Clowes' exclusion from Wesleyan membership. In an appendix he has for the first time gathered details about the friction between Bourne and Clowes. Of course, however, he writes chiefly about the penury and persecutions and triumphs of one of the great Evangelists of England. When Clowes was staying in a one-roomed cottage, he would pray silently in some corner for an hour and then in public prayer 'scale the mount of God'. When he preached, outdoors and indoors, there was often excitement, as at Pentecost, but there was salvation too. An unchallenged place among the perennial heroes of Methodism is his due.

*New Men in Christ Jesus*, by Norman Snaith (The Epworth Press, 4s. 6d.). Dr Snaith is an expert in two things—the Bible and wireless. *Therefore* in the first of these seven 'Talks on Personal Religion' he is able to talk about the Trinity. In most of the others he shows the man-in-the-street that it is just *he* that needs the Holy Spirit more than anything else.

*The Best of John Henry Jowett*, edited, with an introduction by Gerald Kennedy (The Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.). Here are ten sermons, five Bible studies and two lectures by a great preacher who loved best to 'speak comfortably to Jerusalem'. In the introduction there is a brief biography and a discerning estimate.

#### BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

*The Ecumenical Movement*, by Leonard Hodgson (University Press, Sewanee, Tennessee). *Ecumenical Studies: The Bible and the Church's Message to the World*, and *Eschatology and Ethics* (World Council of Churches, 17, route de Malagnou, Geneva). *Full Communion with the Church of England*, by John Lawson (The Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.). *The Destructorum Viciorum of Alexander Carpenter*, by G. R. Owst (S.P.C.K., 5s.). *The Religion behind the Religions*, by G. Randall Jones, and *Psychology and Religious Faith*, by R. W. Wilde (Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d. each).

*The Charm of the Commonplace*, by Muriel Hilton (2s. 6d.); *Great Men*, being Short Impressions of Arthur Stanton and five others, by Ronald Selby Wright (2s. 6d.); *Junior Minister*, by G. Leslie Holdsworth (2s.); *The Way of Integration* (Spiritual Healing Booklet), by H. A. Hodges (1s. 6d.); *Youth and Society* (Beckly Pamphlet), by Bryan H. Reed (6d.); *A Spiritual 'Check-up'*, and *Twelve Ways of Evangelism*, by W. E. Sangster (6d. each)—(The Epworth Press).

#### NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

*The Hibbert Journal*, January (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.).

The World Religions One in Mysticism, by Sir John Stewart-Wallace.

Conquering Faiths (especially Islam and Marxism), by Emile Marmorstein.

Jericho: the Archaeological Problem, by Gurston Goldin.

Sam Qui Sum, by Peter Munz.

*The International Review of Missions*, January (Edinburgh House, 3s. 6d.).

A Survey of the Year 1951, by the Editors.

Modern Man's Basic Need, by T. E. Jessop.

Renaissance in Malaya, by R. A. Blasdell.

*The Expository Times*, December (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 6d.).

Why Jesus Feared the Pharisees, by Harold G. Newsham.

The Textual Critic in the Pulpit (re. R.V., etc.), i, by Roderic Dunkerley.

Joseph Conrad, Apostle of Loyalty, by Albert D. Belden.

do, January.

J. B. Priestley, Novelist of the Common Man, by Albert D. Belden.

The Textual Critic in the Pulpit, ii, by Roderic Dunkerley.

The Doctrine of the Ministry, by Matthew Black.

do, February.

The Wrath of God, by Leon Morris.

(Rev. W. F. Flemington's) Approach to the Doctrine of Baptism, by D. R. Griffiths.

*The Congregational Quarterly*, January (Independent Press, 4s. 6d.).

The Hope and Menace of Immortality, by Nathanael Micklem.

The Congregational Churches and the Ecumenical Movement in America, by Frederic Groetsema.

The Religious Situation in Australia, by Edward S. Kick.

*The Journal of Religion*, October (University of Chicago Press, via Cambridge Press, \$1.75).

A Meeting of Extremes: Operationalism and Personalism, by E. Sheffield Brightman.

Some Metaphysical Gleanings from Prayer, by Julian N. Hartt.

Hume and Kierkegaard, by Richard H. Popkin.

*Scottish Journal of Theology*, December (Oliver & Boyd, 4s. 6d.).

New Testament Perspectives (of the Old Testament), by H. P. Owen.

Kingdom of God and Church (translated), by K. E. Skjoldsgaard.

St Mark 4:34, by C. E. B. Cranfield.

*The Harvard Theological Review*, October (Harvard University Press, via Oxford Press, \$1).

Positive Gains in the Science of Greek Religion, by Martin P. Nilsson.

The Maxim of (Rabbi) Antigonus of Socho, by Elias J. Bickerman.

## Our Contributors

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| A. JOHN BADCOCK<br>M.A.                  | Methodist Minister.  |
| HARRY BELSHAW<br>B.A.                    | In connexion with the Methodist Conference in Ireland. After two years as Resident Chaplain to the Methodist College, Belfast (inaugurating that appointment), went to the Gold Coast in 1936, serving on the staff of Wesley College, Kumasi. For some years in charge of the Department of English at the College.   |
| HARRY BUCKLEY                            | Methodist Minister. Served for five years in French West Africa; and since 1945 in Southern Rhodesia.  |
| CYRIL J. DAVEY                           | Methodist Minister. Garrison Chaplain in India 1939-46 and Minister of New Delhi Free Church. Author of books on India, missionary subjects, and biography, including <i>The March of Methodism</i> (official popular history of the Methodist Missionary Society). Specially interested in play writing, Youth work, overseas travel, and Rotary—which last two combined led him to Pestalozzi.   |
| TOM DRING                                | Methodist Minister. College revealed a gift for Logic and Moral Philosophy (was known as 'College Logician'). Ten years in Circuit work. Lent by Conference to British and Foreign Bible Society for 28 years. Kept in touch with Philosophic thought and Scientific discovery throughout ministry. Regular contributor to the <i>Newcastle Press</i> , and book reviewer to the <i>Sunday Times</i> .   |
| G. H. FINDLAY<br>M.A.                    | Methodist Minister. His hobby since his days at Woodhouse Grove School (1893-1900) has always been hymns and tunes, as choir-member, organist, and preacher.   |
| T. FRANCIS GLASSON<br>M.A., D.D.         | Methodist Minister. Author of <i>The Second Advent</i> and <i>Thomas Glasson: Lay Preacher</i> .   |
| WILBERT F. HOWARD<br>F.B.A., M.A., D.D.  | Sometime Principal of Handsworth College, Birmingham, and Tutor in New Testament Language and Literature and Classics; President Methodist Church 1944 and 1945. Awarded the Burkitt Bronze Medal of the British Academy, 'for distinguished contributions to Biblical studies'. Author of <i>The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation</i> ; <i>Christianity according to St John</i> ; <i>The Romance of New Testament Scholarship</i> . Contributor of theological journals. |
| R. KISSACK<br>M.A., B.D.                 | Minister of Wesley Memorial Church, Oxford. In 1950 went to Asbury Park, New Jersey, on pulpit exchange. Originally a Classical scholar at Cambridge, his interest now centres on Church History as a background to the study of the Pastoral ideal through the ages.  |
| V. DONALD SIDONS<br>M.B.E., D.F.C., B.A. | Methodist Minister. Served in both world wars. Author of <i>Religious Basis of Citizenship</i> , and pamphlet, <i>The Meaning of Baptism</i> , in 'Little Books of the Kindly Light' Series.   |
| C. RYDER SMITH<br>B.A., D.D.             | Principal, Richmond College, 1929-40. Professor in Theology, London University, 1932-40. President, Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 1931. Author of many theological books.   |